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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Higher education involves more than providing college coursework, instruction, and experiences to stimulate and develop the intellect. Concern for the development of the whole individual has resulted in efforts to integrate intellectual and personal development within this educational setting. Faculty members may be able to facilitate this integrative process through not only course contacts but also the advisement process. Research programs at Princeton, Stanford, Swarthmore, and the University of Arizona have indicated that the utilization of advising services for programs of study is related to students' personal development needs (Stanford, 1969).

The advisement process thus may provide a viable means through which faculty members can impact on their students' total educational experience within institutions of higher education. Consequently, the utilization of faculty members to assist students with their educational, vocational, and personal concerns is commonly used within institutions of higher education (Bogard, Hornbuckle, & Mahoney, 1977). The literature abounds with illustrations of effective college advisement systems (Levine & Weingart, 1973), new plans to meet changing student needs, and new combinations of existing facilities and functions (Dameron & Wolf, 1974; Ender, 1975; Sheffield & Meskill, 1972).
Underlying these proposals for better college advisement, however, are various factors which may interfere with the development of the basic relationship between the faculty advisor and the student advisee. The advisement process within institutions of higher education has been the target of severe criticism from both faculty and students who charge inadequacy, dehumanization, and routinization (Gibson, 1973). Typically, faculty perceive their roles as advisors to be extracurricular rather than a function integral to education. Students, in turn, feel hesitant and apologetic to use faculty time for advising except for the administratively required signatures or releases (Crookston, 1972a; Gibson, 1973).

Another potential interference is communication. Kramer and Gardner (1977) suggest that ineffective communication is conceivably the primary source of many of the problems which evolve through the advisement process. Hence, much of the difficulty which exists between the advisor and the advisee may either be precipitated by poor communication or made more serious as a result of ineffective communication.

Since advisement can have a significant impact on the lives of college students and since there exist barriers to this process, the removal or modification of obstructive factors would be most beneficial in promoting the necessary development of this fundamental faculty/student relationship.

In analysis of the process of college advisement, it is essential to develop a conceptualization of college advisement in the context of need, purposes, and differential roles (with related
characteristics and qualities, rewards, and structures) for both advisors and advisees. Based on the findings of such an analysis, it should be possible to determine the necessity for the development and implementation of a change system within the process of college advisement.

Examination of previous literature, however, does not reveal the existence of any plan of systematic educational evaluation related to the organization of college advisement, to the procedures exercised in advisement, or to the performance of individual faculty advisors in terms of perceived effectiveness. College advisement represents a complex and difficult area for study since it does not appear to have definite boundaries. This lack of definitiveness thereby lends support to the need for evaluating the college advisement process. However, immediate direct evaluation of this process would appear to be premature.

Writers in the area of educational evaluation all too often depict evaluation as consisting solely of direct planning and implementation of the process. A fundamental activity not generally incorporated in the major tasks germane to program evaluation, however, is preplanning: establishing an appropriate basis on which to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation. Such is the case with the college advisement process. Before consideration of the evaluation of college advisement can occur, it is necessary to first identify the basic elements of the process of advisement and the need for evaluation. Meaningful evaluation of college advisement cannot occur until the purpose(s) and components of the advisement process are
clearly defined. The development of preplanning guidelines in the context of the college advisement process is the major focus of this dissertation.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this investigation was to produce a set of systematic preplanning guidelines which can be used to develop an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to plan and implement an evaluation of the process of college advisement. A secondary purpose was to identify a model or models of evaluation appropriate for evaluating the college advisement process. The specific objectives addressed within this investigation include the following:

1. To identify the major components of the college advisement process.

2. To identify the major components of various models of educational evaluation as they relate to the college advisement process.

3. To develop a set of procedural guidelines which provide practical suggestions and meaningful information and direction concerning the preplanning phase of an evaluation of the college advisement process.

4. To design the procedural guidelines to be applicable to either the college advisement process as a whole or to specific aspects of the process of college advisement.

5. To determine the adequacy of the procedural guidelines for providing sufficient information to guide evaluation of the college
advisement process.

6. To develop recommendations and modifications for the use of these guidelines in systematically preplanning an evaluation of the college advisement process.

7. To identify an appropriate evaluation model(s) which may be used to evaluate college advisement.

Rationale

The procedural guidelines developed in this dissertation were designed to provide a systematic way of approaching the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement. The development of such guidelines was, however, hampered by the diversity which exists in the advisement process.

All institutions of higher education profess their own philosophy of education, appropriate available resources, and formulate and identify certain student needs. With regard to demographic characteristics, most institutions are unique; both faculty and students exemplify a diversity of backgrounds. Therefore, the implication is that the college advisement approach, not the institution itself, is the significant variable. With regard to advisement, it is the responsibility of each institution to routinely evaluate its specific approach, utilizing the opinions of faculty advisors and administrators in addition to those opinions expressed by student advisees.

The purpose of this effort was not to indicate any single advisement process as most appropriate for all institutions of higher education. Conversely, it was intended to identify generally agreed upon
dimensions and components of the college advisement process to which a set of procedural guidelines could be applied. The guidelines are designed to be used within a setting in which the college advisement process is already established and functioning. They are not designed to specify an evaluation methodology for college advisement. Rather, the purpose is to present a comprehensive list of considerations and activities that will provide an information base sufficient to guide evaluation of the college advisement process. Then, if warranted, an evaluation of the college advisement process can be planned and implemented using models of educational evaluation herein identified as being appropriate or other models which meet the needs of the desired evaluation effort.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is divided into four major sections. The first section is a review of research pertaining to the process of college advisement. The second section is a review of research inherent in the field of educational evaluation. The third section provides a discussion of the process of preplanning an evaluation and its utilization with college advisement. The last section presents a synopsis of the review of literature and focuses on a discussion of the applicability of various models of educational evaluation within the context of the process of college advisement.

The Process of College Advisement

In addition to their fundamental responsibility for classroom instruction, it is assumed that both college and university faculty will fulfill various other functions. These secondary tasks may include directing research, serving on different committees, consulting, providing community assistance, and advising students in various capacities. The opinion of some researchers has been that faculty members were more concerned with research, graduate instruction, and external consultation, than with quality undergraduate instruction, to the detriment of quality instruction (Chronister,
Research, however, has indicated that the majority of faculty view classroom instruction, as opposed to research and publishing, as a fundamental endeavor and as a primary avenue of satisfaction (Gaff & Wilson, 1971; Perry, 1969). Furthermore, faculty members are beginning to perceive their jobs as more of an interpersonal process. Consequently, in view of this newly adopted interpersonal role of the faculty, the process of college advisement has slowly begun to gain some recognition and acceptance as a legitimate and fundamental function.

College advisement has been referred to as an integral component of the overall intention of education, the development of individuals (Meyers, 1964; Milton, 1972; Moore, 1965). On the other hand, college advisement has not always been recognized as a valid faculty function. Faculty have been accused of demonstrating a lack of commitment and performance of undergraduate advisement that is flagrantly inadequate (Cameron, 1943; Dressel, 1973; Furniss, 1970; Miller, 1972). Furthermore, little attempt has been effected by faculty to improve the process of college advisement (Dressel, 1973; Hallberg, 1964).

Historically, the college advisor has been involved with "helping the student choose a major or an occupation as a central decision around which to begin organizing his/her life" (Crookston, 1972a, p. 12). Faculty and students, however, often assume different meanings of the term "advisement." Since many faculty have conceptualized teaching as strictly related to course matter presented either in the classroom or in the laboratory, they have assumed advisement to be of
a secondary, less crucial nature. College advisement has been perceived as "an added burden, an extracurricular, non-teaching activity" (Crookston, 1972a, p. 16). Expectations concerning the services of the advisor have also been confusing. One position has been that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to "advise" while it is the responsibility of the student to take advantage of that service. Specific built-in expectations or requisites (course selection, sectioning approvals, signatures, etc.) have existed and it has been the responsibility of the advisor to assure student compliance. As a result, some advisors have perceived themselves as nothing more than administrative control personnel, a contention with which students have readily agreed.

Students have also responded to the perplexing conceptualization of what the college advisement process purports to be and what it actually is. The college advisor has been presented as someone whose "advice" may be respected or ignored at the discretion of the student; however, this preference has seldom prevailed. Under most circumstances, the student has been required to secure the advisor's authorization or approval. Consequently, students have perceived the advisor as the controlling agent in the advisement relationship and as having the sole responsibility in the decision-making process, regardless of efforts on the part of the advisor to conscientiously advise and to have the students assume the responsibility for decisions (Crookston, 1972a).

College advisement has been conceptualized not only as providing direction in developing a program of study, assessing students'}
educational growth and vocational intentions (Chickering, 1969; Crookston, 1972a; Hardee, 1970), but also as "facilitating the student's rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavioral awareness, and skills in problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation through persuasion, interpretation, evaluation, motivation, and integration" (Grites, 1974, pp. 8-9). Review of the literature has suggested that college faculty advisement and instruction conceivably fulfill almost the same educational function. Teaching has been described as the "communication between two or more people in which appropriate changes in the behavior of the learners occur as a result of the teacher's conveyance of an idea or feeling about a subject" (Grites, 1974, p. 8). According to Riskind (1971), the teacher has evolved into an expert in some discipline, a socialization agent, a role model, and a conveyor of impressions and reactions.

Investigation of these portrayals has indicated the mutual characteristic shared by the two functions of college advisement and teaching—communication of impressions or feelings for the purpose of eliciting some behavioral change. College advisement, therefore, should not be conceived of as an unseemly, dislocative role of the faculty, but instead a natural adjunct to the teaching responsibility (Borland, 1973; Cameron, 1943; Farnsworth, 1962; Hardee, 1970).

Definitions of College Advisement

Central to a conceptualization of the college advisement process is an awareness and interpretation of the many definitions of college
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advisement which are reported in the literature. College advisement is a complex activity which has gained recognition in assisting students to develop an awareness of, and appreciation for, their maximal educational advantages. "Advising assists students to realize the maximum educational benefits available to them by helping them to better understand themselves and to learn to use the resources of an educational institution to meet their special educational needs and aspirations" (Crockett, 1978, p. i). In addition, Kramer and Gardner (1977) stated that college advisement was "(1) clarifying needs through the recognition and identification of advisee and advisor roles, and (2) responding to or meeting needs arising from the role acted by the advisee with one appropriate or parallel for the advisor" (p. 22). Furthermore, advisement was "greatly enhanced or facilitated by an advisor's awareness of the interconnectedness of the many roles played and willingness to incorporate these roles in the discussion one at a time rather than mixing them together" (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 22).

The college advisement relationship is a process involving planning, change, and evaluation and not just a series of isolated events. Kramer and Gardner (1977) suggested:

Advising is a series of activities undertaken by two principals, advisor and advisee, to accomplish the advisee's, and to some extent the institution's, goals for progress through a complex learning experience. The advisor is the institutional representative charged with aiding the advisee in formulating those goals and in making reasonable or systematic progress to achieve them. In a sense, the advisor is both an agent of the institution to ensure that the advisee achieves minimal standards, and an agent of the advisee in achieving advisee standards. (p. 26)
Thorpe (1955) suggested that college advisement maximizes the benefit that faculty can confer in availing themselves to students who wish to consult periodically with them on academic or other matters. In addition, the process of college advisement has been depicted as providing the faculty member with insights and understandings which broaden his/her perspective, enhance his/her understanding of and appreciation for students, and better his/her teaching (Johnson, 1952).

The foregoing studies seem to be summarized in Mayhew's (1977) list of six elements which are central to a meaningful interpretation of college advisement. The process of college advisement includes:

1. Helping students to clarify their values and goals to better understand themselves as persons.
2. Helping students understand the nature and purpose of higher education.
3. Helping students explore educational and career options, and links between academic preparation and the world of work.
4. Helping students plan educational programs consistent with their interests and abilities.
5. Assisting students in a continual monitoring and evaluation of their educational progress.
6. Integrating the institution's many resources to meet students' special educational needs and aspirations.

In brief, the process of college advisement serves to coordinate the total educational experience. Furthermore, the past views of the process of college advisement appear to be well reflected in Mayhew's description of advisement.
Dimensions of College Advisement

College advisement has been variously defined by researchers of the subject, but the consensus of opinion undeniably points to the fact that college advisement fulfills a great many needs and performs an important duty within the educational system. It is important to identify the various dimensions (types) of college advisement in order to achieve the highest possible standards so that the advisement process can be performed to the satisfaction of all concerned.

College students have been perceived as sharing many interests, attitudes, and natural dispositions with faculty, and one of the major consequences of their college experience—and inferentially of their advisement relationship with faculty—has been to accentuate those interests and concerns (Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood, & Barry, 1975). Critics of higher education (Alberti, 1972; Bogard et al., 1977; Gaff & Wilson, 1971; Grites, 1974; Moore, 1965; Williams, 1977; Wilson et al., 1975) have asserted that effective education necessitates close working relationships between faculty and students, and have stressed the significance of close faculty-student interaction. These same critics have interpreted this interaction not only as a mechanism by which the transmission of knowledge and student intellectual growth has best been facilitated, but also as an educational goal in its own right. Advisement within institutions of higher education has subsequently been assigned equal importance with faculty teaching styles and practices within the classroom. In view of this situation, it would seem of major importance that methods and means
of advisement be given careful scrutiny and as scrupulously planned as are the methods and means for actual teaching.

A philosophic orientation pertaining to the dimensions of the process of college advisement has gradually evolved to encompass the full development of students. Shoben (1953) has referred to the educational objectives of both the process of college advisement and of higher education as aiding students in recognizing maximum personal potential of others as well as of themselves. This process helps to make their future goals more understandable with regard to both professional and personal objectives, and facilitates their understanding of education as it applies both to their lives as students and as graduates.

As it becomes increasingly apparent that knowledge attained can only be utilized to its fullest extent if the learners concerned have a comprehensive understanding of themselves, their skills, their motivations, their empathies with their fellow man, etc., the importance of synchronizing college advisement with faculty teaching clearly emerges.

In addition, the dimensions of the process of college advisement have been conceptualized within a miniature society in which students acquire all the necessary attributes with which to make a meaningful contribution within the larger society (Shoben, 1953). Services within the college advisement process have, therefore, varied from (a) familiarizing and orienting students in recognizing the nature and availability of institutions of higher education and what they have to offer, (b) disseminating information concerning institutional
requisites (ground rules under which they do exist), to (c) formulating relationships with advisors who can be there to distribute information, listen to problems, and perhaps give advice and counsel (Allan, 1976; Crockett, 1978; Grites, 1974; Kramer & Gardner, 1977).

The very complexity of the dimensions of the process of college advisement demands a systematized, inclusive approach capable of giving constructive guidelines to the advisory staff.

The dimensions of the college advisement process have been interpreted by Kramer and Gardner (1977) as incorporating some combination of the following functions and objectives:

1. Academic advising refers to specific academic matters, such as course selection, programming, dropping and adding courses, and advice rendered to your students concerning academic programs and careers.

2. Career advising is that form of academic advising that you do to translate career choices into educational goals and to relate academic curricula to career opportunities. (p. 35)

Related but not always considered integral to the advisement process have been the following dimensions:

3. Counseling or assisting students in dealing with emotional or psychological adjustment problems.

4. Career counseling using psychological procedures to help a student with the self-evaluation and recognition of capabilities and interests.

5. Career planning relating the outcome of the evaluation of career counseling to information currently available about world of work. (p. 35)

The psychological impact of good college advisement has never been more apparent than in the present day atmosphere of increasing stress and tensions. College advisement, therefore, has been
represented as a set of activities that are related to, but differentiated from, the operations of counseling, career counseling, and career planning.

Throughout the literature, two difficulties have prevailed—those of stating and maintaining a conceptualization of (a) the dimensions of the process of college advisement, and (b) the possible relationships and overlapping functions between the activities of counseling and advisement. Inherent in each of the activities related to college advisement, however, has been the concept of informational advisement, which most institutions of higher education have agreed is the very least that an advisor must provide in any capacity of the advisement process (Grites, 1974; Hardee, 1970; Kramer & Gardner, 1977; Metz, 1976). Advisors have been perceived as being knowledgeable about requisites, policies, and procedures of their respective institutions. Advisors have been expected to demonstrate an awareness of, and knowledge about, courses, resources, career and graduate school opportunities, career choices, and available student services or counseling agencies on campus. Since 80% of advisement appears to be informational by nature (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 38), failure to furnish this exemplary fund of knowledge means failure to set up a firm advisement relationship with students. Such advisors are perceived to be somewhat less than satisfactory in their advisement capacity, and advisees will not return for further discussions. Being a member of faculty does not ensure an automatic knowledge of general affairs concerning students. Since sound information is directly connected with further interchange, it is important that
advisors are familiar with the necessary information.

The heavy emphasis upon the need for advisors to have on hand information of all kinds seems to mesh with Mayhew's (1977) Point 6, that the process of college advisement includes "integrating the institution's many resources to meet students' special educational needs and aspirations" (p. 1). Supplying information, though, is only one facet of the advisor's work—-at least of equal importance is each of Mayhew's other five points. It would seem almost impossible for advisors to constantly have at their fingertips all required information. It is feasible, however, that they should make every effort to have reputable sources to which the advisee could apply for the required information.

As previously mentioned, college advisement serves to formulate relationships with advisors who are available to distribute information, listen to problems, and perhaps give advice and counsel (Allan, 1976; Crockett, 1978; Grites, 1974; Kramer & Gardner, 1977). An important first step, however, in the process of college advisement is to formulate and maintain a conceptualization of the potential relationships and overlapping functions between the various dimensions of advisement which may consist of the following:

1. Academic advising, which refers to academic programs.
2. Career advising, which refers to the relationship between academic curricula and career opportunities.
3. Counseling, which refers to emotional problems.
4. Career counseling, which refers to self-evaluation and recognition of capabilities and interests.
5. Career planning, which refers to the relationship between capabilities and interests and available career opportunities. Only through an awareness of these dimensions, therefore, can close working relationships be established and sustained between faculty advisors and student advisees.

Roles of Advisors

College advisement is based upon the nature of the task, knowledge of the differential skills and competencies of both parties concerned, and some agreement through negotiation on the terms of the relationship itself. Regardless of the relationship to be defined, Crookston (1972a) stated that the goal was toward openness, acceptance, trust, sharing of data, and collaborative problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty is found in the differential meaning that faculty and students attach to the term "advisors' roles." Perceptions and expectations of the faculty advisors' roles by students and faculty, themselves, may differ considerably. "Differences in role expectations create a role conflict for the advisor: a conflict between the role as perceived by the advisor and the role as defined by students" (Cadzella, 1977, p. 2). According to Sargent and Williamson (1966), the concept of role "aids in describing and interpreting social interaction, especially within clearly defined groups. Role, as the social psychologist defines it, permits individual variation, stresses the perceptual factor and reciprocal nature of the interaction, and includes 'situational' roles" (p. 415).
Siegel (1968) suggested the existence of two schools of thought regarding the faculty advisor's role. Some authorities have indicated that the advisor serves in the capacity of a resource, or a patron—in effect, "he who advises least, advises best" (p. 156). The majority, however, have subscribed to the opinion that the fundamental responsibility of the advisor is to offer expert guidance. In essence, the advisor's essential duties have been conceived as serving in the capacity of an educational leader and as a "source of strength and continuity for students" (Siegel, 1968, p. 156).

Hardee (1970) characterized the role requirements of the faculty advisor as tridimensional: (a) a concern for and knowledge of the institutional purpose and the manner in which that purpose is used for the student's education, (b) an understanding of the fact that the student's goals are a blend of many personal and external factors, and (c) the facilitation of the student's learning through personal contacts with the student. Attempting to be all these things to a student within the structure of teaching, research, and service could nonetheless lead to less than adequate advising. Yet the faculty advisor is often perceived as the first choice in a hierarchy of helping sources for solving educational and vocational problems (Christensen & Magoon, 1974; Kramer, Berger, & Miller, 1974).

Kramer and Gardner (1977) proposed that an advisement relationship involving a student advisee and a faculty advisor who incorporates the posture of advisor and adult is both preferable and profitable. As an advisor, one can seldom respond through one role alone, "because an advisor is, by consensus, more than one role" (p. 22).
Consequently, a suitable manner in which to view oneself as an advisor is to perceive oneself as a manipulator of roles "so closely interconnected that your function is to include many (not just one) in any interaction" (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 22).

Chickering (1969) suggested that a useful response by faculty advisors incorporates five requisite ingredients: listening, watching, feeling, inquiring, and respecting. "In dealing with your advisees, you must attend to the media, the message, and the sender" (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 15).

From the advisee's viewpoint:

The most helpful things you can do beyond the technical, informational aspects of advising are to try to understand his or her college experience, to clarify what is being experienced, to illuminate more fully the problem and the ideas that surround it—and to do this in a manner that exhibits a high degree of respect for the advisee. (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 15).

According to Gadzella (1977), knowledge of students' perceptions of an ideal advisor might aid in narrowing the differences between the advisor's perception of his/her role and the student's perception of the advisor's role. This information could assist advisors in determining what students expect of them and, as a result, enable the advisors to better meet the needs of their students. The following list presents a comprehensive compilation of the kinds of knowledge, background, and skills derived from the literature (Bogard et al., 1977; Crookston, 1972b; Gadzella, 1977; Grites, 1974; Hardee, 1959; Kramer & Gardner, 1977) perceived by both faculty and students as being essential qualities of the advisor for effective advising:
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1. Understanding the background of experience, aptitude, achievement, and interests of each student.

2. Availability of the advisor.


4. Knowledge of institutional/departmental procedures and policies.

5. Ability to refer students to correct resources.

6. Information on vocational and career plans.

7. Concern for student's academic progress.

8. Establishing rapport and a sound two-way communication relationship with the student.

9. Listening to the student and his/her expressions of interest and concern for the matter at hand.

10. Interacting with the student in the cooperative exploration of his/her problems, academic and nonacademic.

11. Understanding of the student's personal needs.

12. Offering advice, but placing the responsibility upon the student to weigh the evidence and make decisions within the framework of the university policy.

13. Respect for decisions.

In brief, the advisor seems to require the ability "to help students define and develop realistic goals, to perceive their needs accurately, and to match these needs with appropriate institutional resources. This is best done in the context of a caring and trusting relationship" (Mayhew, 1977, p. 1).
Implicit in this list of components crucial to an effective advisement relationship are the methods of effective communication incorporated within that relationship. Kramer and Gardner (1977) suggested that ineffective communication was perhaps the principal source of difficulty in advising. Many problems between an advisor and an advisee either stemmed from poor communication or were made more serious due to ineffective communication. What and how the advisor communicates can convey to the advisee the advisor's interest, concern, understanding, and commitment to advise and deal with him/her. Consequently, communications are very important in that they can have a positive or negative impact. According to Collingwood (undated), this impact limited, restricted, or extended the degree to which a facilitative and productive advisement relationship was established.

The following list presents those conditions identified in the literature (Carkhuff, 1969; Collingwood, undated; Swensen, 1973) as basic to the communication process:

1. Empathy
2. Warmth or respect
3. Genuineness
4. Concreteness
5. Self-disclosure
6. Immediacy
7. Confrontation

There is a need to establish good rapport between the advisor and the advisee. Without good rapport, there is less chance the communication
process will be satisfying and effective, less chance for a positive relationship to be established, and consequently, less chance for the advisement process to occur successfully. Better communication leads to a better relationship, and the result is a more effective and satisfactory delivery of advisement services.

The disparities between this advisement position and confusion are critical, because it is the responsibility of the advisor to incorporate and examine the varying conditions in such a manner that they do not become indistinguishable. According to Kramer and Gardner (1977), clarity evolves through "identifying and communicating where you are coming from" (p. 22). Therefore, when discussing the process of advisement, it is crucial to establish that both advisor and advisee are following the same process of advisement. Otherwise, serious difficulties result from deviations from this requisite mutual view of what roles are suitable within the advisement relationship. Kramer and Gardner (1977) suggested that the initial activity in alleviating confusion is "to increase your awareness of roles and your ability to recognize commonly assumed roles" (p. 18). The following roles and associated definitions proposed by Kramer and Gardner (1977) simplify this activity:

1. Adult— one who combines age and experience to cope successfully with life; grown; mature.

2. Expert— one whose training, achievement, and position signify mastery of a subject matter area; specialist.

3. Teacher— one who is charged by an institution with transmission of skills, knowledge, or information to others; educator; instructor; tutor.
4. Friend—one with whom one has an emotional and personal attachment (affection); companion; confidant; comrade; associate.

5. Judge—one who by virtue of special skills, training, or position is afforded the activity of evaluating or assessing; arbiter; judicator; critic.

6. Authority—one who has prestige and/or power and/or is accorded sanction by an institution to give directions and have them carried out; official. (p. 18)

In total perspective, therefore:

The complex interaction of the tasks of achieving greater emotional security, defining adequate social and sexual roles, and developing autonomous competencies by your advisee demands that in your roles of advisor and adult you assume little, accept all available data as potentially significant, and proceed with judiciousness and humility. (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 15)

The college advisor has the responsibility to share information and experience, to express suggestions and constraints, but ultimately must disassociate himself/herself and provide the advisee the occasion to do what only he or she can do: formulate choices and judgments and accept subsequent responsibility for them.

In the advisor's roles, the concept of communication is of paramount importance. As noted earlier, the advisor must not only "increase his awareness of roles [and his] ability to recognize commonly assumed roles" (Kramer & Gardner, 1977, p. 18), but must be able to communicate the various roles. The advisor should serve as a "source of strength and continuity for students" (Siegel, 1968, p. 156) and again, he must be able to communicate this strength and continuity to his advisees. The advisor must establish rapport and a sound two-way communication in all his relationships with the advisee. Ineffective communication has been cited as creating difficulty in the advisement
relationship (Kramer & Gardner, 1977). It is the manner in which the advisor communicates with the advisees that suggests to them the advisor's interest in, and commitment toward, their advisement relationship. Consequently, communication plays a vital part in any one of the advisor's numerous roles.

Qualifications of Advisors

Little agreement has been achieved on who qualifies as a college advisor. Fordyce and O'Banion (1971) were in favor of the professional counselor assuming the responsibilities of the college advisor. Their preference was based on the premise that each semester's course selection had implications for students' curricula, which subsequently pertained to personal, career, and vocational aspirations. The professional counselor was perceived as being detached and unbiased, yet demonstrating the expertise essential to comprehend and examine the factors involved and to advise the student accordingly. Allen (1971) conceptualized the process of college advisement as integral to the "total guidance or student personnel process" in which the students receive support in formulating conclusions. A competent instructional program requires a sound counseling program in which the aggregate faculty must be counselor oriented. The process of college advisement "in the sense of course selection, curriculum planning, and limited vocational and personal advising can be handled by the faculty, leaving more time for the counselor to spend with referral cases requiring greater use of professional knowledge" (Bogard et al., 1977, p. 5).
Proponents of the process of college advisement administered by faculty members have postulated various convincing reasons for assigning instructional staff the unique or major responsibility for college advisement. Arguments most frequently cited included similarity of the teaching and advisement functions (Hardee, 1970), expertness and specificity of teaching faculty (Hallberg, 1964), instructor knowledge of academic programs (Gallagher & Demos, 1970), and frequency of contact between faculty and students (Evans & Neagley, 1973).

Individuals proposing counseling personnel management of advisement responsibilities have posited equally persuasive evidence. Dameron and Wolf (1974) suggested a model of college advisement in which a professional counselor assumes major responsibility for the advisement process, with the assistance of pre- and paraprofessional personnel. Their rationale for exclusion of faculty personnel included such reasons as "insufficient training and experience, cost involved in released time for advising, restricted knowledge of employment market trends, and lack of program coordinating ability" (Teague, 1977, p. 281). The process of college advisement, however, has not yet been afforded recognition as a distinct operation, independent of the customary teaching responsibilities, nor considered in evaluation measures to determine salary, promotion, or tenure (Astin & Lee, 1967; Chronicle, 1973; Davis & Derbigny, 1955; Gaff & Wilson, 1971; Gustad, 1961; Love, 1949). Were faculty members compensated accordingly for their advisement duties, they, themselves, would more readily perceive it as a valid function; furthermore, they would be
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willing to exert a more conscientious effort. Therefore, salary, promotion, and tenure decisions should be based on the evaluation of all dimensions of the college faculty personnel, with emphasis given to the overall role of college advisement.

Metz (1976) suggested that perhaps the greatest difficulty in selecting college advisors is related to lack of knowledge about which "attributes/skills/characteristics" contribute to the making of a good advisor. The following suggestions were offered as possible solutions to this dilemma:

1. We select only those persons who express a willingness to serve as an advisor--where this effectively wipes out all faculty and staff selections in an academic unit, that unit should be required to furnish professional and/or peer advisors for its students.

2. We select only that person who regularly has both space and time available for advising--I have no magic minimum for either to propose but would suggest that the advisee feel some sense of personal privacy in the location and feel no sense of "let's-hurry-up-and-get-this-thing-done" in the conversation.

3. We select persons who can and will commit themselves to participation in advisor training programs.

4. We select persons without regard for hierarchical position within the institution (assuming conditions 1., 2., 3., above, already are met)--deans and chairpersons and classified staff and freshmen should be allowed to be selected.

5. We select persons from all academic disciplines where advising is to be done in a cross- or non-disciplinary setting--concern for student development appears in an array of physical and intellectual forms.

6. We select persons who are emotionally capable of hearing--this is obviously the most difficult attribute to identify and I leave you to your own favorite instruments and screening devices. (p. 9)
Metz (1976) further proposed that "the advisor behavior desired be moulded from training, actual experience, and systematic evaluation" (p. 10).

The preceding presents a well-structured plan for selecting advisors. The type of person to be selected, however, must also be included in this plan. According to the literature (Chathaparampil, 1970; Grites, 1974; Jones, 1963; Metz, 1976; Miller, 1950; Robinson, 1960), persons who qualify to be advisors are those who are interested in the personal needs of their advisees and are able to relate this concern in affable advisement relationships.

Perceptions and Expectations Pertaining to College Advisement

An examination of the process of college advisement must not only review the activities of the faculty advisors and their attitudes toward student advisees, but must include the perceptions and expectations of the advisees, themselves, because both are directly involved in the advisement relationship. Recent studies have accentuated the concerns of student advisees regarding the effectiveness of faculty advisors. Students are insisting upon demonstrated competency, accountability, and equal input (Grites, 1974; Jenks, 1969; Young, 1968). Student advisees' expectations of faculty advisors include "accurate information about programs, careers and institutional procedures, and a personal interest shown in them" (Grites, 1974, p. 12).

Kaufman (1968) and Chickering (1969) suggested that faculty advisors assume the responsibility of fostering both the intellectual
and emotional growth and development of their student advisees. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) supported the credibility of faculty advisors with student advisees by demonstrating that faculty advisors are more influential, particularly in the development of vocational aspirations, than are parents. Furthermore, the extent to which faculty advisors were perceived as exerting influence on the student advisees' intellectual development was directly related to the frequency of advisor-advisee interrelationships (Alberti, 1972; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Gaff, 1973; Grites, 1974).

Grites (1974) demonstrated that "student perceptions of advisors were directly related to the advisor's knowledge of campus rules and regulations, the number and length of advising sessions, student-advisor contacts outside of the advisory situation, and the desire for such contacts" (p. 63). Furthermore, student advisees expected the advisement relationship to be conducted on an interpersonal basis. Interestingly, student advisees' perceptions of faculty advisors:

were not related to or affected by the student's grade point average, class standing, sex, race or transfer status or by the teacher's age, length of time as an advisor, sex, race, ranking of advising function importance or number of advisees. Neither were student perceptions of advisors related to the length of the advisor-advisee relationship. (Grites, 1974, p. 64)

The conclusion that college advisors are capable of making several contributions in the identification and management of dissension in the process of advisement and in the advisement relationship can be drawn from the following four assumptions postulated by Kramer and Gardner (1977):
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1. Advisees view the advisor as holding achieved status and, as a result, generally attribute high legitimate power or social esteem to the advisor.

2. Advisees expect or take for granted that advisors will perform competently as adults in their adult role.

3. The advisor's failure in meeting expectations in the role of adult creates for the advisee a strong negative reaction toward the advisor.

4. Management of conflict and issues surrounding the exercise of authority are pervasive concerns that all advisors must face. (pp. 33-34)

Consequently, the evidence presented in the literature indicates the necessity for faculty advisors to develop an awareness of, and appreciation for, the personal requisites of their student advisees, and to communicate this discernment in a warm, friendly interpersonal relationship.

Synopsis

It is apparent from the literature that the college advisement process entails many facets. The major points from the literature review are summarized below:

1. The diversity of roles played by the college advisor.

2. The importance of awareness, both on the part of the advisor and the advisee, of the varying definitions and dimensions of college advisement.

3. The need for advisors to formulate warm, comprehensive, and enduring relationships in all areas of commitment to student advisees.

4. The paramount importance of good communications between the advisor and advisee in all aspects of the college advisement process.
5. The need for a definite plan for the **selection** of advisors, and definite **qualities** to be required in potential advisors.

Therefore, faculty persons engaged in college advisement and aware of the above variables can facilitate both the advisement process and the development of preplanning guidelines for evaluating college advisement.

**The Process of Educational Evaluation**

Evaluation is a complex procedure, containing elements of a dozen or more distinct activities. It involves determining the worth of a single element, such as an experience or an idea, as well as the worth of more complex entities, such as a program or an objective. An evaluation assumes standards or criteria, so that the value of a single element, such as a suggestion, may be judged on some intrinsic foundation— for example, its relevance or irrelevance. The value of several optional ideas may be determined through comparison of their relative adaptability to a predesigned program, while the value of an experience may be determined by the extent to which it provides desired changes in others who have had the same experience.

Since evaluation is a process for describing, determining, and reporting information to suitable decision-makers, it must necessarily be incorporated within the educational process. Once preplanning considerations have been addressed, it becomes necessary to subscribe to systematic means for ongoing evaluation of a proposed advisement process. Hence, several established evaluation models are being reviewed for their relevancy and appropriateness within the context of
college advisement. The following general criteria summarized from Guba are used as the basis for model appropriateness: (a) concise, (b) time efficient, (c) cost effective, (d) systematic, (e) parsimonious, and (f) practical.

Stake's Countenance and Responsive Evaluation Models

In his Countenance and Responsive Evaluation Models, Stake (1967, 1972) advanced the assumption that the primary activity in evaluation involves description and judgment. This concept requires that the evaluator collect, analyze, and report the judgments of all persons associated with the program, but refrain from making judgments himself.

The Countenance Model (Stake, 1967) incorporates a definition of evaluation as a process through which the worth of an educational program is described and assessed. The purposes of evaluation will deviate under varying circumstances, but the main purpose is to describe and to judge. Fundamentally, descriptions and judgments are made to satisfy the demands of objectives, but care must be taken not to neglect more extensive positive and negative effects.

Stake (1967) felt that evaluators should assist persons in judging a program by providing them with an inclusive portrayal of the program. This portrayal must include the program's antecedents, transactions, and outcomes, and comparisons of all three must be made with regard to what the staff planned, and to what they actually accomplished.
The evaluator's analysis of goals helps program staff determine whether they can logically assume that the program design can produce the required results. Analysis of the facts aids the audience for whom the evaluative data are intended in deciding if the program actualities really accomplished the program objectives (Guba, Note 1). Stake believes also that the evaluator should specify the standards for judging programs and should examine the program for possible side effects.

A major limitation of Stake's (1967) Countenance Model is its lack of clarity in a number of areas which include: (a) the means for eliciting standards, and (b) the ways of accounting for rival merits and criteria, or multiple criteria. Therefore, it appears to be unsuitable in planning and implementing an evaluation of the college advisement process in which the procedural guidelines for preplanning the evaluation must be generalizable to advisement within any institution of higher education.

In his Responsive Evaluation Model, Stake's (1972) definition holds that evaluation is a process for the portrayal and merit (defined as a function of the possible multiple value positions held by the pertinent audiences) of an educational program. The purpose of evaluation is to respond to audience requirements for information, particularly in terms of the value perspectives held by each audience (Guba, Note 1). In other words, the evaluator collects judgments, characterizes, analyzes, and reports back to the people who are involved in the program and wants them to make the final judgments.
According to Stake's conceptualization, evaluators should not conduct their evaluations according to any predetermined plan; nor should they require that an explanation of the program to be studied should be made before the evaluation study is commenced. Conversely, they must be acutely aware of evaluation needs as they arise in a program, and must exercise every available means in fulfilling these needs. Their primary need is to assist their clients. The fundamental issue of Responsive Evaluation is warm and uninterrupted communication between the evaluator and his client.

A major limitation of Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model is its approach which is both informal and random. Planning and implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement requires the development of systematic procedural guidelines. Furthermore, the model fails to state clearly what the issues are or how they are to be resolved.

Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM)

Provus (cited in Yavorsky, 1976) developed the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) which seeks to provide information about educational programs to meet two purposes: improvement and assessment.

Evaluation is defined within the DEM as:

the comparison of what is, a performance (P), to an expectation of what should be, a standard (S). If a difference is found to exist between the standard and the performance, this difference is known as a discrepancy (D). Discrepancies may be positive, where performance exceeds the standard, or negative, where performance is less than the standard. (p. 3)
Provus' model was specifically designed to help large city schools in the evaluation of their federal projects. It aids personnel in stabilizing their programs and then in determining the worth of these programs.

Provus (cited in Yavorsky, 1976) proposed five stages of evaluation within his DEM, each of which requires a "standard (a written program design)"

1. Design Evaluation—outside experts, program staff, and other interested parties judge the substantive adequacy of program plans.

2. Input Evaluation—seeks to determine whether the program has been installed as planned: preconditions met, inputs in their places, and processes set in motion.

3. Process Evaluation—monitors the sequential accomplishment of enabling objectives (those sub-objectives which "enable" the achievement of major program goals) specified in the program design.

4. Output Evaluation—is essentially "summative" in nature—i.e., its main purpose is program assessment. It builds on the foundation provided by input and process evaluation to (1) determine the degree to which program terminal objectives have been achieved, and (2) substantiate causation.

5. Cost-Benefit Analysis—refers to the comparison of two or more programs producing the same outputs. (p. 4)

A major limitation of the DEM is its preference for total staff participation in the development of the program design which is extremely time consuming and demands consensus among participants. The DEM, however, is appropriate for use in evaluating the process of college advisement. A model that operates in a defined way across a number of settings could be applicable to faculty advisors with varying backgrounds, student advisees differing in environment and
nationality, and diverse geographical or physical settings. The concept of looking at the component parts of the advisement process makes it possible to consider any one component for its own worth. This, again, validates the DEM for use in evaluating the process of college advisement.

Wolf's Judicial Model

Since it would appear that Wolf has never tendered a definition of evaluation, it must be assumed that he believes the process of evaluation to be a guide to decision making, especially in the area of issues. It can also be inferred that he views evaluation both as a way of measuring effects, and as a method of judging merit. Wolf's purpose is to clarify, apprize, and judge issues which are based on the interests of the people influenced by or implicated in the item or activity being evaluated.

The Wolf Judicial Model (Guba, Note 2) is very similar to a formal court hearing. First the activity being evaluated is assessed with regard to information accrued during an earlier, formative evaluation. The next step is the identification of the issues in point, followed by prioritization of the issues and the preparation of formal arguments to be used. Now prehearing discovery sessions are held, to which are added any relevant data from the earlier formative evaluation. Then the hearing, patterned on an administrative hearing, is held. After an exchange of views and an examination of all available material, an evaluation is made, which results in judgments being handed down and recommendations put forth. All information which is
pertinent to the matters in hand and admissible under the agreed-upon rules may be considered in the above exercise.

Guba (Note 2) summarized the design of the Wolf Judicial Model in the following manner:

The evaluator must arrange for: preliminary identification of issues, the reduction in their number to a manageable few by determining their priority, the preparation (by each counsel) of formal arguments, pre-hearing discovery sessions at which counsel exchange information about the cases they will make and determine the procedural rules, selection of the hearing panelists, a hearing modeled on the administrative hearing as a prototype, and rendering of judgments (including recommendations) by a hearing panel. (p. 1)

The procedures allow for the probable admission of any prevailing evaluations and are characteristic of the Judicial Model being modeled on those of the administrative hearing in the law.

This process can be used to evaluate many diverse entities, including such things as programs, staff members, accommodations, etc. Also, in this approach issues may be clarified and members of interested groups allowed to make contributions.

Wolf's Judicial Model is the first to stress that human testimony is less fallible than typical evaluation, evidence which is predominantly circumstantial and, therefore, not as forceful. It reinforces contributions by recording important questions raised by concerned groups of people. It excludes objectivity as virtually unobtainable and in its place puts adversary proceedings (Guba, Note 2). It works well where ponderous evaluations are being considered, especially when political involvement is present; and it allows all evidence to be viewed impartially and justly.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
However, the overall function of this model is misleading. It is time consuming and expensive. It can only work with evaluators trained in courtroom techniques, techniques not usually possessed by educators. Since it imposes no penalties for perjury, deceptive evidence can safely be given. It is difficult to handle and so is worthwhile only in the evaluation of extremely important inquiries. Given these limitations, especially the one concerned with the need for special skills, it is obvious that Wolf's Judicial Model would not be helpful in planning and implementing an evaluation of the college advisement process.

**Scriven's Goal-free and Pathway Comparison Models of Evaluation**

In his historical article, *The Methodology of Evaluation*, Scriven (1967) defined evaluation as:

A methodological activity which consists simply in the gathering and combining of performance data with a weighted set of goal scales to yield either comparative or numerical ratings, and in the justification of (a) the data gathering instruments, (b) the weightings, and (c) the selection of goals. (p. 4)

Scriven (1972), however, has indicated that he would now replace the term, "goal scales," with "criterion scales."

In addition to ascertaining whether goals have been attained, Scriven (1967) stated that it was also imperative to judge those goals. This view is further supported by Stufflebeam (1976) in his statement that "the aim of evaluation is always to judge and that it is the evaluator's responsibility to make the judgments" (p. 9). Scriven (1967) postulated that in establishing merit, evaluation
played two primary roles—"formative evaluation which assists in the
development of programs, and summative evaluation which assesses the
merit of programs after they have been developed and subsequently
implemented" (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 9).

Scriven has been acclaimed for his conceptualizations of Goal-
free Evaluation and Pathway Evaluation. In Goal-free evaluation, the
evaluator intentionally remains uninformed as to the specific goals
of the program or management and "searches for all effects of a pro-
gram irrespective of any rhetoric concerning what the program was in-
tended to produce" (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 9). One advantage of Goal-
free evaluation is that those individuals whose programs are being
evaluated are not able to influence the evaluator in their favor
(Guba, Note 3). The evaluator has no prior orientation to the pro-
gram and its goals, thereby remaining completely objective while pay-
ing attention to what is happening within the program to determine
what is real versus what is ideal. A major disadvantage, however, of
Goal-free evaluation is that if the evaluator does not know what any
of the goals of the program are, he could look in the wrong place for
effects. Furthermore, because Goal-free evaluation is not outcome-
oriented, the evaluator could provide a description of something
which he observed as a process without knowing the actual intent of
the process. Because the design of Goal-free evaluation is unstruc-
tured and definite goals are not specified, Goal-free evaluation
would not be appropriate in planning and implementing an evaluation
of the college advisement process which incorporates explicit yet
generalizable goals and objectives.
Pathway evaluation can best be approached through Scriven's Pathway Comparison Model which is a checklist with nine steps evaluators should follow in guiding their own evaluations or developing designs to judge another's evaluation. Two basic stages are incorporated within this model: (a) data analysis, which consists of characterizing the program or product, and (b) credentiality, which Scriven refers to as validating the program or product. The nine steps are incorporated within these two stages in the following manner:

**Data Analysis**

1. Characterizing the nature of the program to be evaluated.
2. Clarifying the nature of the conclusion wanted from the evaluation.
3. Assessing evidence about cause-and-effect relationships between independent and dependent variables in the program.
4. Comprehensively checking for all consequences of the program.
5. Determining and assessing the criteria of merit and the philosophical arguments pertaining to the program.
6. Assessing various kinds of program costs.

**Credentialing**

7. Identifying and assessing the program's critical competitors.
8. Identifying the program's constituents and performing a needs assessment to determine the program's potential impact.
9. Forming a conclusion about the merit of the program.
Because the Pathway Comparison Model is primarily a checklist to be used more appropriately within the context of meta evaluation which is, in essence, evaluators evaluating evaluations, it does not appear to be utilizable within the planning and implementing stages of an evaluation of the process of college advisement. The primary purpose of this enterprise is to produce a set of systematic guidelines for developing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to evaluate the advisement process. The Pathway Comparison Model could, however, be used as a supplementary aid throughout the development of the procedural guidelines or as a final checklist with which to determine the efficacy of the guidelines.

Guba's Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry (N/I)

Naturalistic Inquiry (N/I) is not actually a new inquiry, having its roots in ethnography and phenomenology. There are a number of definitions of N/I. House said, "I would label as 'naturalistic' evaluation which attempts to arrive at naturalistic generalizations on the part of the audience . . . uses ordinary language . . . based on informal everyday reasoning" (Guba, 1978, p. 3). Wolf and Tymitz asserted that, "It is a process geared to the uncovering of many idiosyncratic but nonetheless important stories told by real people, about real events, in real and natural ways" (Guba, 1978, p. 3). Neither of these definitions could be labeled as systematic or formal.

Because it is relatively difficult to accurately describe N/I, the following statements are drawn from a few of the papers collected by Willems and Raush (1969) in a systematic attempt to formulate a
Sechrest (cited in Willems & Raush, 1969), a psychologist, suggested that, "There are any number of ways in which an attitude may manifest itself, and with one exception (automatic response measures), the manifestations are not limited to the laboratory. It is the stimulus situation, not the response, that defines a naturalistic method" (p. 152). Gutmann (cited in Willems & Raush, 1969), a psychologist interested in cross-cultural studies, said:

For me, the crux of the naturalist's method is that it does not treat nature as passive. The naturalistic assumption in any field, is that intrinsic orders exist "out there" and that these regularities will organize and drive events even though our theories take no notice of them. . . . Thus, the techniques and instruments of the naturalist are aimed at bringing out, at highlighting some implicit order in the domain of his interest, and toward turning the implicit order into explicit data . . . the special task of the naturalist is to generate data. (p. 162)

In summary, Willems and Raush stated that:

1. Naturalistic inquiry is always a matter of degree.

2. The degree to which a study is naturalistic is a function of what the investigator does.

3. What the investigator does in relation to stimuli, independent variables, or antecedent conditions is one crucial dimension.

4. What the investigator does in restricting the response range or domain of the subject's output is a secondary dimension in the minds of two of the authors (Willems and Raush).

5. Barker, Menzel, and Gutmann suggest that naturalistic inquiry provides the means for an investigator to approach behavioral phenomena as if for the first time, with minimal determination by prior theoretical categories.

6. The term "naturalistic" is understood by all the above to be a term that modifies "research" or "method"
but not "phenomena." (Guba, 1978, pp. 6-8)

The purpose of the naturalistic inquirer is the discovery of phenomena "whose empirical elaboration and testing would be worthwhile" (Guba, 1978, p. 13). If he wishes to test relationships between interesting phenomena, he will look for instances in which the relationship can be observed rather than organizing it under controlled conditions.

According to Guba (1978) the naturalistic inquirer:

seeks a holistic view that will permit him to describe and understand phenomena as wholes, or at least in ways that reflect their complexity. He enters the field and builds outwards from wherever he happens to find himself. Each step in his inquiry depends on the sum of his insights from previous steps. . . . The naturalistic inquirer tends to be open-minded, exploratory, and complex in his position. (pp. 13-14)

In the N/I Model, "the design can be given in advance only incompletely" (Guba, 1978, p. 14). If specific details were given regarding the design, this would "place constraints on either antecedent conditions or outputs or both" (Guba, 1978, p. 14). Thus, the nature of the inquiry would no longer be naturalistic, but conventional. Instead, the design is formulated during the course of the investigation, and is continually changing, through fresh input and ongoing perceptions. Consequently, "emergent, variable designs are among the hallmarks of naturalistic inquiry" (Guba, 1978, p. 14).

The naturalistic inquirer takes a very flexible view of the nature of reality. Much of the reality which must be dealt with exists only in the minds of individual people with differing perceptions, and who is to say who is right and who is wrong. Since the
N/I Model tends toward a pluralistic view, it would be useless in a study requiring definite results. Also, within the N/I Model, the issue of generalizability is very much at stake, since occurring relationships are much more likely to be observed than those effected under laboratory conditions. Therefore, because it is desired that the guidelines developed within this investigation be generalizable to the process of advisement within any institution of higher education, the N/I Model is deemed inappropriate for planning and implementing an evaluation of college advisement.

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of Educational Evaluation

In general, Stufflebeam (1976) refers to evaluation as the ascertainment of merit. Specifically,

Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and applying descriptive and judgmental information; concerning some object's merit; as revealed by its goals, design, implementation, and results; and for purposes of decision making and accountability. (p. 28)

Stufflebeam (1976) has also suggested numerous major issues to keep in mind pertaining to this definition of evaluation:

1. Evaluation may appropriately be used to assess a wide range of objects including programs, projects, personnel, students, courses, extra curricular activities, facilities, materials, institutions, budgets, and evaluations.

2. Evaluations yield descriptive and judgmental information about the goals, design, implementation, and results of some object.

3. Evaluation is performed in the service of decision making; hence, it should provide information which is useful to decision makers either for drawing conclusions or projecting future actions.
4. By maintaining a record of past decisions and of the information that was available to support them, evaluation also assists decision makers to be accountable for their past decisions and actions.

5. Evaluation is a cyclic, continuing process and, therefore, is best implemented through a systematic program.

6. The evaluation process includes the three main steps of delineating, obtaining, and applying. These steps provide the basis for a methodology of evaluation.

7. The delineating and applying steps in the evaluation process are interface activities requiring collaboration between evaluators and decision makers, while the obtaining step is largely a technical activity which is executed mainly by evaluators.

8. Since evaluations provide information for making decisions that often affect peoples' lives, evaluations should be conducted ethically, produce technically sound information, prove useful to clients and audiences, and not cost more than they are worth. (pp. 29-31)

Figure 1 represents Stufflebeam's proposed definition of evaluation and of the key terms in this definition.

Definition: EVALUATION IS THE (1. PROCESS) OF (2. DELINEATING), (3. OBTAINING), AND (4. APPLYING) (5. DESCRIPTIVE) AND (6. JUDGMENTAL) (7. INFORMATION); CONCERNING SOME (8. OBJECT'S) (9. MERIT) AS REVEALED BY ITS (10. GOALS), (11. DESIGN), (12. IMPLEMENTATION), AND (13. RESULTS); AND FOR PURPOSES OF (14. DECISION MAKING) AND (15. ACCOUNTABILITY)

Terms: 1. Process. A particular, continuing and cyclical activity subsuming many methods and involving a number of steps or operations.

2. Delineating. Focusing information requirements to be served by evaluation through such steps as specifying, defining, and explicating.
3. **Obtaining.** Making available through such processes as collecting, organizing, and analyzing, and through such formal means as statistics and measurement.

4. **Applying.** Combining data and information into meaningful messages and using the information to serve the purposes of the evaluation.

5. **Descriptive.** Representational through presentation of observed facts.

6. **Judgmental.** Relating to subjective opinions about goodness or badness, desirability or undesirability, or other estimates of worth.

7. **Information.** Descriptive or interpretive data about entities (tangible or intangible) and their relationships.

8. **Object.** The thing, such as a program, student, or textbook, that is being evaluated.

9. **Merit.** An object's worth or excellence in quality or performance.

10. **Goals.** The ends toward which effort or ambition is directed.

11. **Design.** An underlying scheme intended to govern functioning.

12. **Implementation.** The extent that a design is operationalized and applied.

13. **Results.** Things obtained, achieved, or brought about by particular actions.

14. **Decision making.** Making up one's mind as in drawing conclusions from evidence or choosing future courses of action.

15. **Accountability.** Ability to furnish a justifying analysis or a detailed explanation of the discharge of one's responsibilities.

---

**Figure 1.** Definition of evaluation and of the key terms in this definition.
In his evaluation model, Stufflebeam (1976) proposed the term, CIPP, which is an acronym incorporating the first letters in the names of four methods of evaluation:

The C stands for Context Evaluation which is a kind of needs assessment. The I represents Input Evaluation which is a means of assessing competing plans. The first P denotes Process Evaluation which assesses the implementation of plans. And the second P refers to Product Evaluation which is a way of assessing outcomes. (p. 1)

Within the domain of the CIPP Model, Stufflebeam (1976) identified four types of educational decisions:

1. Planning decisions--specify major changes that are needed in a program.

2. Structuring decisions--specify the means to achieve the ends which have been established as a result of planning decisions.

3. Implementing decisions--those involved in carrying through the action plan.

4. Recycling decisions--those used in determining whether attainments match objectives, in determining the merit of both intended and unintended outcomes, and in determining whether to continue, terminate, evolve, or drastically modify an activity. (pp. 41-46)

Coupled with each of these four decision types are the four previously mentioned models of evaluation incorporated in CIPP:

Context evaluation serves planning decisions to determine objectives; input evaluation serves structuring decisions to determine program and project designs; process evaluation serves implementing decisions to control program and project operations; and product evaluation serves recycling decisions to judge and react to program and project attainments. (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 48)

Stufflebeam (1976) has also utilized the CIPP Model as a basis for maintaining accountability which he defined as "the ability to furnish a justifying analysis or a detailed explanation of the
discharge of one's responsibilities" (p. 70). Each evaluation type identifies specific accountability needs.

1. Context evaluation, through assisting in the choice of objectives, provides a record of the objectives chosen and the bases for their choice.

2. Input evaluation, through assisting in the choice of a procedural strategy for achieving specified objectives, provides a record of the alternative strategies considered and the reasons for choosing one of them.

3. Process evaluation, through assisting in implementing a project design, provides a record of the actual process as it occurred.

4. Product evaluation, through identifying and assessing attainments, can supply a record of decisions about a procedure based on effectiveness data. (pp. 70-73)

The structure of the evaluation design utilized to implement the CIPP Model as presented in Figure 2 includes the following four components:

1. Delineation of information needs.
2. Plan for obtaining information.
4. Administrative summary. (Stufflebeam, 1976, pp. 61-65)

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model can be utilized "to service planning, structuring, implementing or recycling decisions [and also] to resolve accountability issues" (Guba, Note 4).

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model is implemented in the service of decision making; therefore, during an evaluation of the process of college advisement, it would provide information which is useful either for drawing conclusions or projecting future actions pertaining to the advisement process. For the purposes of monitoring the process
**Delineation of Information Needs**

Definition of system  
Specification of decision and accountability questions  
Statement of evaluation policies  
Statement of evaluation assumptions

**Plan for Obtaining Information**

Collecting of data  
Organization of data  
Analysis of data

**Plan for Applying Information**

Definition of audiences  
Preparation of reports  
Dissemination of information

**Administrative Summary**

Summarization of the evaluation schedule  
Plan for meeting staff and resource requirements  
Provisions for meeting policy requirements  
Evaluation of the evaluation  
Provision for periodic updating of the evaluation design  
Provision of an evaluation budget

Figure 2. Structure of evaluation design.
of college advisement and the subsequent provision of information on needed change, the CIPP Model would provide continuous and systematic evaluation. Finally, the CIPP Model conducts evaluation which contributes to the selection of objectives, thereby fulfilling the requisite of accountability through a report of the objectives selected and the rationale for their inclusion. However, a serious limitation of the CIPP Model is its demand for a very high level of commitment with regards to both personnel and financial requisites. Furthermore, the implementation stage of this model is both time consuming and expensive.

Synopsis

The predominant theme in educational evaluation is the description and assessment of an educational program. This concept is supported in various ways in each of the following models:

5. Guba's Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry—turning implicit order into explicit data.
6. Stufflebeam's CIPP Model—obtaining and applying descriptive and judgmental information for purposes of decision making and accountability.

The Process of Preplanning an Evaluation

Research concerning the process of educational evaluation appears to focus primarily on the planning and implementation stages of evaluation processes. Little mention is made of the activity referred to as preplanning which entails establishing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation.

Adequate preplanning is the primary step in an evaluation design and precedes the subsequent tasks of planning, programming, implementing, and controlling a successful evaluation effort. Success is not assured; however, the probability is increased of evaluation achieving its desired outcome if commensurate preplanning procedures have been developed (Cook, 1971; Hamet, 1974; Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Guba, Hammond, Merriman, & Provus, 1971).

Preplanning is essential in evaluation of the college advisement process. Meaningful evaluation of advisement cannot occur until the selection process of advisors is explained and the purpose and components of the advisor training programs are defined. An evaluation cannot be conducted without first knowing the basic elements of the advisement process. Essential to the educational evaluation process is consideration not only of isolated advisor behavior, but also of the expectations which both the advisor and the advisee bring to the
advisement relationship. Evaluation should also recognize the time constraints of advisor guidance and information—what is pertinent today may be irrelevant tomorrow.

According to Metz (1976), educational evaluation and its outcomes can be utilized to facilitate better selection and training procedures—"whom we choose and how we prepare those chosen may be at the heart of the students' expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with our advising programs" (p. 10). The same position can readily be adapted to the faculty's expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their present advisement program.

In other words, preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement necessitates a distinct definition of what the task entails and the establishment of specific characteristics and functions of advisement. Preplanning enhances the likelihood of a successful evaluation effort. Therefore, within the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the process of college advisement, the primary function is to determine the need for a change system and the manner in which any needed changes and improvements can be accomplished. This function can be fulfilled through the development of procedural guidelines which represent an attempt to provide a systematic method in which to approach the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of the process of college advisement.

Any preplanning, however, must be judged against certain criteria. Cook (1971), Hamet (1974), and Stufflebeam et al. (1971) have provided work from which certain criteria can be established. These criteria for preplanning include the following:
1. Provide timely and accurate information to the program manager (department chairperson) and his/her staff (faculty advisors).

2. Facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation procedure.

3. Facilitate effective planning before the initiation of the evaluation effort.

4. Be sufficiently flexible to permit essential revisions in decisions and/or planning to be made before initiation of the evaluation.

5. Provide the mechanisms and procedures to transmit the purpose(s), goals, and programs required to achieve the goals to the program manager and his/her staff.

6. Provide planning for judicious utilization of all needed resources (equipment, facilities, materials, money, and people).

7. Facilitate the attainment of consensus regarding goals and programs to attain the goals.

8. Facilitate development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of an evaluation.

9. Facilitate identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals.

10. Provide a positive climate for any future program evaluation.

These become the criteria for the advisement preplanning procedures detailed in Chapter IV. The determination of the agreement between the guidelines and these criteria represent the tasks the review panel is being asked to perform. The criteria sheet for the
review panel reflects these criteria.

**Synopsis**

Preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement involves the establishment of an appropriate basis on which to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation. This basis is determined through the utilization of procedural guidelines which are designed to provide practical suggestions and meaningful information concerning the preplanning stage in an evaluation of the college advisement process.

**Synopsis of Literature Review**

**The Process of College Advisement**

Although the process of college advisement has generally been assigned a subordinate role within most institutions of higher education, faculty interest and involvement continue to be the crucial elements in a promising advisement program. Because of the reduced job market for individuals within higher education and today's interest in the "whole" student, "advising excellence should go hand in hand with excellence in teaching and research" (Bachhuber, 1977, p. 45). Before considering the necessity to improve a specific institution's process of college advisement, it is imperative to initially determine faculty and student understanding of college advisement "in the context of differing roles, rewards, and structures" (Bogard et al., 1977, p. 5).
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In view of the newly adopted interpersonal role of the faculty (the majority of faculty view classroom instruction as a fundamental endeavor, and as a primary avenue of satisfaction) the process of college advisement has slowly begun to gain some recognition and acceptance as a legitimate and fundamental function. In the past, however, little attempt has been made by faculty to improve the process of college advisement. Different meanings of the term "advisement" have been assumed by faculty members, with the result that some advisors have seen themselves as simply administrative control personnel.

Students, on their part, have regarded the advisor as the controlling agent in the advisement relationship and have left the sole responsibility of decision making to the advisor. Since investigation of the several roles of teachers has revealed the mutual characteristics shared by the two functions of teaching and college advisement—communication of impressions or feelings for the purpose of eliciting some behavioral change—college advisement should be viewed as a natural adjunct to the teaching responsibility.

College advisement is a complex activity which has gained recognition in assisting students to develop an awareness of, and appreciation for, their maximal educational advantages. The college advisement relationship is a process involving planning, change and evaluation, not just a series of isolated events.

College advisement fulfills a great many needs, and performs an important duty within the educational system. The dimensions of the college advisement process must, therefore, achieve certain overall
standards in order that this service will be performed to the highest interests of all concerned. Also, methods and means of advisement must be given careful scrutiny and be scrupulously planned. Clearly, knowledge attained can only be utilized to its fullest extent if the learners concerned have a comprehensive understanding of themselves, their skills, their motivation, their empathies with their fellow man, etc. This fact indubitably points to the importance of synchronizing the college advisement process with faculty teaching.

The very complexity of the dimensions of the process of college advisement demands a systematized, inclusive approach, capable of giving constructive guidelines to the advisory staff. It is important that advisors be familiar with the necessary information, at least to the extent that they are aware of reputable sources to which the advisee could apply for the required information.

The role requirements of the faculty are numerous, and are further complicated by the fact that faculty members and students view these roles from differing perspectives. This problem arises from poor or ineffective communication and must be remedied in the context of a close and trusting relationship. Also, it is important that advisor and advisee are following the same process of college advisement.

Relevant to the use of faculty members as advisors is training and experience, cost involved, adequate compensation in terms of money, promotion, tenure, etc. Advisors must be prepared to foster both the intellectual and emotional growth and development of their student advisees. In short, faculty advisors must be alert and
understanding with regard to the personal needs of their student advisees, and make them aware of this through close, interpersonal communication.

The Process of Educational Evaluation

Educational evaluation must be continuous and systematic if it is to be used purposefully in monitoring the process of college advisement and, subsequently, providing information on projected change. Evaluation is a complex procedure involving the determination of the worth of a single element, as well as of more complex bodies. It is a process for describing and determining the value of an educational program and reporting findings to a suitable audience. Evaluation must, therefore, be included with other educational procedures.

Six models of educational evaluation were reviewed. In his Countenance and Responsive Evaluation Models, Stake (1967, 1972) contends that an evaluator should help others to judge, but refrain from judging, himself. The evaluator should, however, specify the standards for judging the program and should examine the program for possible side effects.

Stake's Countenance Model lacks clarity in a number of areas, and is too informal and too random to be used in an evaluation of the process of college advisement which requires the development of systematic procedural guidelines with which to conduct the evaluation. The Responsive Model fails to state clearly what the issues are or how they are to be resolved, and thus is unsuitable for an evaluation of the advisement process in which the preplanning guidelines must be
generalizable to the process of college advisement within any institution of higher education.

In his DEM, Provus' fundamental position was "that evaluation always involves determining the discrepancy between performance and some standard" (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 12). This model was specifically designed to meet the needs of large city schools in evaluating their federal projects. Within his DEM, Provus proposed five stages of evaluation: (a) design evaluation, (b) input evaluation: (c) process evaluation, (d) output evaluation, and (e) cost-benefit analysis. Each of the above stages requires a written program design.

A model such as DEM operating in a circumscribed manner across a number of settings could be suitable for faculty advisors with diverse experiences and student advisees with different demographic characteristics. Also, the notion of looking at the component parts of a program validates the DEM for use in evaluating the process of college advisement.

Wolf's Judicial Model is patterned on a formal court hearing and follows court procedures through their entirety. Its purpose is to clarify, measure, and judge issues, based on the interests of the persons influenced by or involved in the purpose or activity being evaluated.

Since Wolf's Judicial Model is time consuming and expensive, can work only with trained evaluators, which effectively eliminates most teachers, and encourages false evidence because of the lack of penalties for perjury, it is of no use within the capacity of this investigation for the purposes of evaluating the process of college
Scriven states that "the aim of evaluation is always to judge and it is the evaluator's responsibility to make the judgments" (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 9). He further theorizes that in establishing merit, formative evaluation assists in the development of programs, while summative evaluation assesses the merit of programs after they have been developed and subsequently implemented.

In Scriven's Goal-free Evaluation Model, the evaluator is not informed of the specific goals of the program or management. The evaluator must search for all effects of a program while remaining totally unaware of what the program is to produce. The unstructured design of Goal-free evaluation, together with the lack of specified goals, makes it unsuitable for planning and implementing an evaluation of college advisement.

The techniques and instruments of Guba's Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry (N/I) are aimed at bringing out and at highlighting some implicit order in the realm of the naturalist's interest, and toward transforming the implicit order into explicit data. The naturalist primarily proliferates data and his main purpose is to discover phenomena whose empirical elaboration and testing would be worthwhile.

In Guba's N/I Model, only an incomplete design can be given in advance. Given, specific details would place constraints on either antecedent conditions, or outputs, or both, thus changing the inquiry from naturalistic to conventional. In N/I, the design is formulated during the course of the investigation and is in a state of continual
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flux due to new information and continuing observations. The tendency toward a pluralistic view, and its suspect position on the issue of generalizability, make Guba's N/I Model inappropriate for utilization within the process of college advisement which must be generalizable in numerous situations.

Stufflebeam (1976) referred to evaluation as the ascertainment of merit. In his evaluation model, Stufflebeam proposed the term, CIPP, to designate four methods of evaluation. "Context Evaluation is a kind of needs assessment. Input Evaluation is a means of assessing competing plans. Process Evaluation assesses the implementation of plans. Product Evaluation is a way of assessing outcomes" (p. 1).

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model fulfills the two basic premises of: (a) serving decision making, and (b) providing a basis for accountability. Consequently, within an evaluation of the process of college advisement, the CIPP Model can provide information useful to decision makers for drawing conclusions or projecting future actions regarding advisement. Furthermore, the requisite of accountability can be fulfilled through a record of the objectives selected and the rationale for their inclusion. However, a very high level of commitment is required of both personnel and funding sources. In addition, the implementation process of the CIPP Model is both time consuming and expensive.

The Process of Preplanning an Evaluation

Advisement can have a significant impact on the lives of college students. However, the literature does not appear to present any
systematic approach to the process of college advisement. College advisement represents a complex and difficult area for study since it does not appear to have definite boundaries. This lack of definitiveness thereby lends support to the need for evaluating the advisement process.

Some writers in the area of educational evaluation tend to depict evaluation as consisting solely of direct planning and implementation of the process. A fundamental activity not generally incorporated in the major tasks germane to program evaluation, however, is preplanning: establishing an appropriate basis on which to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation. Such is the case with the college advisement process. Before consideration of the evaluation process of college advisement can occur, it is necessary to first provide a clear definition of what the task is and to establish explicit parameters of college advisement. This process can be accomplished through the development of procedural guidelines which represent an attempt to provide a systematic way of approaching the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement.

**Current Study**

Based on the apparent need for preplanning an evaluation of the college advisement process, the primary purpose of this dissertation is to produce a set of systematic preplanning guidelines for developing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to plan and implement an evaluation of the process of college advisement. Additional purposes include the determination of the adequacy of the
guidelines and the identification of a model or models of evaluation appropriate for evaluating the college advisement process.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The fundamental purposes of this dissertation were (a) to produce a set of systematic preplanning guidelines which can be used to develop an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to plan and implement an evaluation of the process of college advisement, (b) to determine the adequacy of the procedural guidelines for providing sufficient information to guide evaluation of the college advisement process, and (c) to identify a model or models of evaluation appropriate for evaluating the college advisement process.

Preplanning Guidelines and Adequacy Determination

Within institutions of higher education, little emphasis has been focused upon the systematic delineation, selection, accumulation, and utilization of evaluative data related to the process of college advisement. In view of this lack of emphasis, guidelines with which to systematically approach the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of the advisement process are needed which (a) are empirically derived but which reflect a broad conceptualization of the college advisement process, (b) focus on specific advisement components, and (c) permit individuals to determine only those constituents which they consider to be relevant.

Therefore, in order to achieve these purposes, the following four steps were involved in the development of the preplanning...
guidelines for approaching an evaluation of the college advisement process (the Guidelines themselves appear in Chapter IV):

1. Identification of the major components of the process of college advisement.

2. Determination of the applicability of various models of educational evaluation to the preplanning process.

3. Development of a set of procedural guidelines to provide a systematic way of approaching the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement.

4. Review of the guidelines by a panel of judges for the purpose of establishing adequacy.

Step 1: Identification of the Components of College Advisement

The initial step was to identify, through a review of the literature, the major components of the process of college advisement in order to develop a conceptual base for the advisement process. Need, purposes, definitions of key elements, and dimensions of college advisement were identified and presented in Chapter II.

Step 2: Determination of the Applicability of Various Evaluation Models

The second step was to identify, through a review of the literature, several models of educational evaluation to determine their appropriateness within the contexts of planning and preplanning an evaluation of college advisement. Purposes, definitions of key elements, and dimensions of each were specified and can be found in
Chapter II.

**Step 3: Development of Procedural Guidelines**

The third step was to develop a set of procedural guidelines for the systematic collection of information with which to determine if there is a need for change or improvement in an existing process of college advisement. This was accomplished through the following activities:

a. Educational evaluation standards were reviewed and utilized to provide direction in the development of the guidelines.

b. The major elements of preplanning were identified.

c. The major parameters of the process of college advisement were identified.

d. Criteria for judging the value of the procedural guidelines were developed.

e. The necessary phases in preplanning were identified and developed.

f. The CIPP Model of educational evaluation was reviewed prior to formulating the procedural guidelines because an examination of the literature revealed certain aspects within the model which are applicable to preplanning an evaluation of college advisement.

g. The final set of guidelines for approaching the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of the college advisement process was developed.

Each of these activities is described below.
a. Review and Utilization of Educational Evaluation Standards (Criteria)

According to Stufflebeam (1978), in developing a methodology for evaluation, "It is important to have in mind an appropriate set of criteria [standards]. These are needed to prescribe necessary and sufficient attributes of evaluation reports and designs" (p. 5). Evaluation must produce technically sound information, i.e., the findings must be both true and generalizable, and the findings must be useful to some audience. Furthermore, the findings must be concerned with cost/effectiveness, i.e., they must be of more value to the audiences than the actual cost of obtaining the information. Such is the case with preplanning.

Certain accepted standards were thus initially identified. Two lists (Sanders & Nafziger, 1976; Stufflebeam, 1978) were chosen as ones containing elements of particular relevance to the preplanning process. While not all of the standards contained in these lists were of direct applicability, several did meet the criteria of (a) technical adequacy, (b) utility, and (c) applicability, and were selected for use in developing the guidelines.

The standards from Sanders and Nafziger's (1976) "Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design" consisted of the following:

I. Regarding the Adequacy of the Evaluation Conceptualization
   A. Scope
   B. Relevance
   C. Flexibility
D. Feasibility

II. Criteria Concerning the Adequacy of the Collection and Processing of Information
   A. Reliability
   B. Objectivity
   C. Representativeness

III. Criteria Concerning the Adequacy of the Presentation and Reporting of Information
   A. Timeliness
   B. Pervasiveness

The standards from Stufflebeam's (1978) "Standards for Judging the Merit of Evaluation Studies" consisted of the following:

I. Technical Adequacy Standards
   1. Described Situation
   3. Authentic Situation
   4. Described Object
   12. Unequivocal Reporting
   13. Complete Reporting
   14. Objective Evaluators

II. Probity Standards
   16. Ethical Human Relations
   17. Legal Human Relations
   20. Honest Reporting

III. Utility Standards
   22. Described Audience
   23. Pertinent Information
b. Identification of Major Elements of Preplanning

The process of preplanning consists of establishing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation. As mentioned previously, however, there is a significant lack of literature pertaining to the preplanning phase of educational evaluation. In view of this lack of emphasis upon preplanning, Stufflebeam's CIPP Model (see Chapter II) was examined to provide a basis from which to develop the preplanning guidelines for an evaluation of college advisement. Because the guidelines were not to be designed to specify an evaluation methodology for college advisement, only the first component of CIPP, context evaluation, was utilized to provide direction in the development of the guidelines.
According to Stufflebeam et al. (1971):

Context evaluation is the most basic type. Its purpose is to provide a rationale for determination of objectives. Specifically, it defines the relevant environment, describes the desired and actual conditions pertaining to that environment, identifies unmet needs and unused opportunities, and diagnoses the problems that prevent needs from being met and opportunities from being used. Diagnosis of problems provides an essential basis for developing objectives whose achievement results in program improvement. (p. 218)

Stufflebeam's (1976) three steps in the implementation of context evaluation were used in identifying the major elements of preplanning:

1. Delineating—"to spell out the ends for the evaluation and to define policies within which the evaluation must be conducted" (p. 61).

2. Obtaining—"to meet the information requirements established in the delineating stage" (p. 63).

3. Applying—"to insure that audiences for the evaluation have timely access to the information they need and that they will receive it in a manner and form which facilitates their use of the information" (p. 64).

Delineation of information needs. Within Stufflebeam's (1976) conceptualization this consists of four subcomponents. Three of the four subcomponents included in the delineation stage of an evaluation design were found appropriate and used in the preplanning guidelines:

1. Define the system within which the evaluation is to be conducted.

2. Identify the decision making and accountability questions to be addressed; these questions should then be defined in relation to who must answer them, what
alternatives they will consider, what criteria they will employ, what information they need, and when they need it.

3. Define the policies within which the evaluation must operate; for example, it is important to determine who will have access to evaluation reports and to define the limits of access to system data for the evaluation team. (pp. 61-63)

The fourth subcomponent, "Define the assumptions for the evaluative activity, including design, measurement, and analysis assumptions" (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 63) was not included in the preplanning guidelines.

Plan for obtaining information. This is the second of Stufflebeam's (1976) components in context evaluation. Three subcomponents are included in the obtaining stage: (a) collecting, (b) organizing, and (c) analyzing information (Stufflebeam, 1976, p. 63). Procedures for all three were included in the Final Procedural Guidelines.

More specifically, the guidelines were structured to provide a means of:

1. Identifying sources of advisement information.
2. Systematically organizing the information.
3. Analyzing the information collected and organized. (See Chapter IV, Section 1)

Plan for applying information. This is the third component in the design of context evaluation. Based upon Stufflebeam's (1976) suggestions the Preplanning Guidelines were devised to include:

1. Potential audiences for reports.
2. The format for evaluation reports.
3. The means for providing information to each audience. (See
Chapter IV, Section 1)

Appendix B contains a detailed description of the evaluation tasks and activities involved in context evaluation. For the purposes of this dissertation, however, only certain elements within context evaluation were identified as being similar to the components necessary in the development of guidelines with which to preplan an evaluation of college advisement. Of those elements selected, adaptations were necessary with some to meet the needs of preplanning.

The following list includes those tasks and activities involved in the process of context evaluation which were used in the development of the preplanning guidelines:

1. Delineation of Information Needs
   1.1 Definition of System
      1.11 Model of the System
         1.111 System Boundaries
         1.112 Elements of the System
         1.113 Characteristics of System Elements
   1.2 Specification of Decisions
      1.22 Statement of the Decision Setting(s)
         1.221 The Decision Authority
         1.222 The Decision Responsibility
         1.223 Decision Influences
         1.224 Clientele for Information
         1.225 Decision Timing
         1.226 Summary of Decision Questions
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1.23 Criterion Variables
   1.231 Questions to be Answered
   1.232 Alternative Answers to Questions
   1.233 Alternative Actions

1.3 Evaluation Policies
   1.31 Access to Data Sources
   1.32 Access to Data Base and Evaluative Information
   1.33 Role of Evaluation Authority
   1.34 Role of Evaluation Responsibility
   1.35 Budget Limitations for Evaluation
   1.36 Scheduling Limitations
   1.37 Reporting Policies

2. Plan for Obtaining Information
   2.1 Collection of Data
      2.11 Information Source (sample)
         2.113 Population
      2.12 Instrumentation
         2.121 Instrument Type
         2.122 Match of Items to Criterion Variables
         2.123 Items of Information
   2.2 Organization of Data
      2.21 Unit of Organization
         2.212 Scoring or Coding Format
   2.3 Analysis of Data
      2.32 Analysis Method
3. Providing Information

3.1 Preparation of Reports

3.11 Report Audiences

3.12 Reporting Levels

3.121 Micro Level Reports
3.122 Macro Level Reports

3.13 Reporting Mode

3.131 Reporting Media
3.132 Report Content
3.133 Report Setting

3.2 Dissemination of Reports

3.21 Procedures for Transmission of Reports
3.22 Procedures for Publication of Reports

c. Identification of Parameters of Advisement

Several major categories and components were identified in the literature as being germane to the process of college advisement and thus were incorporated in the preplanning considerations. These categories included:

1. Functions of the college advisement process (structure of system).

2. Dimensions of the college advisement process (types of advisement).

3. Roles of the college advisor (duties).

4. Professional competencies of the college advisor (expertise).
5. Personal competencies of the college advisor (characteristics).

6. Communication processes in the college advisement process (interaction).

7. Advisor/advisee relationships (interpersonal).

In developing the guidelines care was taken to insure the inclusion of these parameters which are reflected in Preplanning Guide 2 within Chapter IV.

d. Development of Criteria

A list of basic criteria with which to judge preplanning evaluation procedures was generated from the previously mentioned selected educational evaluation standards. Task analysis techniques (Borich, 1974) were utilized in the development of these criteria. According to Sanders and Cunningham (1974) while task analysis is not clearly an evaluative function, it is an essential evaluation-related function of the development process. Formative evaluators are often called upon to perform such functions and, as such, task analysis should be a technique and procedure which the formative evaluator has in his repertoire. Furthermore, "the techniques and procedures used to evaluate needs or objectives are appropriate for the evaluation of task analysis . . . results" (Sanders & Cunningham, 1974, p. 289).

The results of this task analysis are reflected in the Criteria Sheet (Appendix C) which divides the criteria into the major headings of Technical Adequacy, Utility, and Practicality. Each category contains related questions with which to determine the validity of the
guidelines to be utilized in the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the college advisement process.

e. Identification and Development of Necessary Preplanning Phases

Throughout the literature, the process of educational evaluation is depicted as consisting primarily of two stages, planning and implementation. Preplanning, an activity which involves the establishment of an information base sufficient to determine the need to develop and implement evaluation, is often neglected. Sanders and Cunningham (1974) contend that "procedures and techniques for predevelopmental formative evaluation are often nonexistent in typical evaluation systems, or at best they are very informal (p. 280). Due to this seeming lack of predevelopmental activities, Sanders and Cunningham (1974) "recommend the fullest amount of predevelopmental formative evaluation possible (within the constraint of scheduling, costs, and politics) using inexpensive approximations whenever formal, complete techniques and procedures are ruled unrealistic" (p. 280).

Based on this apparent need for preplanning, four phases were determined through task analysis techniques (Borich, 1974) to be essential to the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement. Phases one and two can be found in Chapter II and phases three and four can be found in Chapter IV. The first phase, Procedural Guidelines, includes the purpose of the preplanning stage and the criteria for judging the validity of preplanning evaluation procedures. The second phase, The Preplanning Stage itself, is
comprised of an overview of the procedures to be incorporated in the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the college advisement process. The third phase, Preplanning Steps, consists of a narrative description of the procedural guidelines. The fourth and final phase, Preplanning Guides, contains a checklist of the needed steps and suggested worksheets, matrices, and other forms to illustrate the preplanning steps for the benefit of potential users.

f. Review of the CIPP Model of Evaluation

Several models of educational evaluation were reviewed in the Review of the Literature section to determine their applicability within the context of preplanning an evaluation of college advisement. Based on this review, the CIPP Model was considered to be an appropriate model to be scrutinized for use in preplanning an evaluation of the advisement process.

Therefore, the CIPP Model of evaluation was also reviewed prior to formulating the procedural guidelines because an examination of the literature revealed certain aspects within the model, particularly context evaluation, which were applicable to preplanning an evaluation of college advisement.

g. Final Set of Guidelines

The preceding six steps represent the procedures involved in the systematic formulation of the preplanning guidelines with which to determine the need to develop a change system within the process of college advisement. These complete guidelines are found in Chapter IV.
Step 4: Establishment of Adequacy of Guidelines

The fourth step, which followed guidelines development, was to develop a process for determining the adequacy of the guidelines. A description of this process follows.

According to Brickell and Aslanian (1974), "field testing is not necessarily the preferred method of product validation. Other methods, most of them less expensive, may be more suitable, especially for products not yet in fully mature form" (p. 8). One of the alternatives suggested is the method of inspection by professionals. The collection of opinions from experts during the formative product stage has also been supported by Sanders and Cunningham (1974) as an acceptable technique for product validation. This alternative was selected because of the availability of professionals and experts to serve as reviewers and also because of the limited funds available to this investigator. Therefore, a four-member review panel was recruited to validate the preplanning guidelines developed by this writer.

The review panel consisted of two evaluation experts nationally recognized for their contributions to educational evaluation, and two advisement experts with a combined total of 27 years of advisement activities, each of whom could provide unique expertise and experience to the review process. The team of panelists included:

1. Dr. Mary Anne Bunda
   Associate Director of the Evaluation Center
   Western Michigan University
2. Dr. Paul E. Holkeboer  
   Director of Advisement  
   College of Arts and Sciences  
   Western Michigan University

3. Dr. William H. Kanzler  
   Professor  
   Educational and Professional Development  
   College of Education  
   Western Michigan University

4. Dr. James R. Sanders  
   Associate Director of the Evaluation Center  
   Western Michigan University

Nevo (Note 5) cautioned that "subjectivity is an inherent limitation in the work of any review panel" (p. 86). Nevertheless, a review panel was utilized in this investigation for the main purpose of gaining insight into, and subsequently acquiring a more explicit conceptualization of, the procedures and considerations utilized in the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the college advisement process.

An envelope containing the procedural guidelines was presented to each member of the review panel. Each judge was asked to first review the Criteria Sheet which listed the desired standards of Technical Adequacy, Utility, and Practicality for the guidelines, and then read the material presented in each section of the guidelines. Based on their professional judgment, the judges responded to each question on the Criteria Sheet by placing an (X) in either the "Yes" or "No" column. A comment section was also provided on the Criteria Sheet for further reactions.

After a period of 1 week, the envelopes were collected by this investigator from the four judges and data from the completed criteria
sheets were analyzed.

Percentages were computed to analyze validity results. Analysis included: (a) the total percentage of agreement among the four judges, (b) the total percentage of agreement/nonagreement per question among the four judges, (c) the percentage of agreement/nonagreement per question between the advisement experts, and (d) the percentage of agreement/nonagreement between the evaluation experts.

**Identification of Appropriate Evaluation Models**

Several models of educational evaluation were reviewed in the Review of the Literature section to determine their applicability within the context of planning an evaluation of college advisement. Based on this review, the CIPP and DEM models were considered to be appropriate for planning and implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement.

The DEM operates in a specific way across a variety of settings and could be applied to both faculty advisors and student advisees with diverse experiences and different demographic characteristics. The fact that the process of college advisement can readily be examined in its component parts further supports the use of the DEM in evaluating the advisement process.

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model serves decision making and provides a basis for accountability. Within the context of the process of college advisement, it can provide information with which to draw conclusions or project future actions regarding advisement. The CIPP Model also provides continuous and systematic evaluation during the
process of monitoring advisement and gathering information on needed change. Moreover, a record of the objectives selected and the rationale for their inclusion fulfills the requisite of accountability.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This dissertation involved the following activities: (a) the development of a set of procedural guidelines with which to systematically approach the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement, (b) the validation of the guidelines, and (c) the identification of models of evaluation appropriate for evaluating the process of college advisement. The results of these activities are presented in the following major categories:

1. Procedural guidelines for preplanning an evaluation of college advisement.
2. Validation results.
3. Model identification.

Procedural Guidelines for Preplanning an Evaluation of College Advisement

The guidelines are divided into two sections: Section 1, Preplanning Steps, which consists of an 18-step narrative description of the procedural guidelines; and Section 2, Preplanning Guides, in which a checklist of the needed steps and suggested worksheets, matrices, and other forms are provided to illustrate the preplanning steps for the benefit of potential users.

Figure 3 is a graphic illustration which demonstrates how the preplanning steps of an evaluation of college advisement flow systematically.
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1. Assess needs

2. Describe rationale for advisement

3. Define purpose of advisement

4. Identify decision makers

5. Identify information recipients

6. Prioritize goals and objectives

7. Establish monitoring policies

8. Establish monitoring procedures

9. Select courses of action

10. Decide on alternatives

11. Describe contingency measures

12. Identify constraints

13. Identify evaluator

14. Establish feasible timetable

15. Establish preliminary budget

16. Establish reporting policies

17. Establish reporting procedures

18. Assess preplanning steps

**Key:**
- Action steps
- Assessment and monitoring steps

**Figure 3. Preplanning steps flow chart.**
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Section 1: Preplanning Steps (A Narrative Description)

Step 1: Preparation of a Needs Assessment

Before developing and implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement, it is first imperative to prepare a needs assessment to determine: (a) the needs that should be met or problems to be solved by implementing the evaluation, (b) the political climate in both the institutional and specific departmental settings in terms of each's endorsement of and agreement with the process of college advisement, (c) both the institutional and specific departmental expectations for the process of college advisement in terms of what it should achieve, (d) the likelihood of the process of college advisement successfully meeting the stated needs, and (e) how the process of college advisement will function within the overall policies and goals of both the institutional and specific departmental systems.

The needs assessment is the critical initial process which transpires during the preplanning stage of an evaluation at which time the need is determined whether to initiate the evaluation of the process of college advisement. Results from the needs assessment should also facilitate the determination of expectations for the evaluation of the college advisement process. Major difficulties encountered when preparing a complete needs assessment, however, include the requisite time commitment and the cost.

The intent at this time is not to provide specific guidelines with which to implement a needs assessment but simply to indicate the
suggested steps one could follow. A needs assessment has been conceptualized as consisting of the following nine steps:

1. The identification of a problem or a need by an individual or a group of individuals.

2. The presentation of information, verbally or preferably in writing, to the top administrator followed by a meeting to secure time release for personnel and funding to conduct a needs assessment.

3. If approved, the allocation of human resources based on a statement of purpose, goals, and a step-by-step procedure with which to conduct the needs assessment.

4. The development of a format including any instruments needed, such as questionnaires or surveys, with which to carry out the needs assessment.

5. The development and presentation of a budget for the cost and calendar of activities and events to the top administration.

6. If approved, the implementation of the needs assessment; if not approved, a modification of the needs assessment.

7. An analysis of the results.

8. A description of the conclusions and findings and a review with the top administration.

9. If approved by the top administration, the initiation of the plans for the program. If not approved, a modification and resubmission to the top administration.
Step 2: Description of the Rationale for College Advisement

The rationale depicts why the process of college advisement is to be formulated and operationalized. In essence, the rationale for college advisement is the "why" of the process of college advisement which originates from the causal factors and predicted outcomes. It is suggested in the literature that college advisement should be conceived of as a natural adjunct to the teaching responsibility (Borland, 1973; Cameron, 1943; Farnsworth, 1962; Hardee, 1970) and that historically advisement has evolved as a means of "helping the student choose a major or an occupation as a central decision around which to begin organizing his/her life" (Crookston, 1972, p. 12). Therefore, it is important to incorporate relevant historical and background information within the stated rationale. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 3.)

Step 3: Definition of the Purpose(s) of College Advisement

The purpose(s) of college advisement should be stated in explicit terms to describe the department's conceptualization of what the process of college advisement purports to be and what it actually is. The literature typically portrays advisement as serving many different purposes. Mayhew (1977) incorporated many of these elements in a concise list of functions considered to be central to a meaningful interpretation of the process of college advisement. The purposes of college advisement include:

1. Helping students to clarify their values and goals to better understand themselves as persons.
2. Helping students understand the nature and purpose of higher education.

3. Helping students explore educational and career options, and links between academic preparation and the world of work.

4. Helping students plan educational programs consistent with their interests and abilities.

5. Assisting students in a continual monitoring and evaluation of their educational progress.

6. Integrating the institution's many resources to meet students' special educational goals and aspirations.

In brief, the process of college advisement serves to coordinate the total educational experience.

The statement of purpose(s) may be quite diversified, depending on the primary causal factors for the inception of the advisement process. Two conceivable causal factors from which the process of college advisement may be subsequently developed and implemented include: (a) a problem that needs to be resolved, i.e., instructors are complaining that because so many students are seeking advisement of a personal nature, they are unable to fulfill their intended function of providing information advisement concerning the instructional quality or content of their courses; and (b) an educational need, i.e., to provide career planning and career counseling services within the department to undergraduate seniors to facilitate appropriate job selection and placement. It is critical that preplanning includes such primary causal factors leading to the development of the process of college advisement in the stated purpose(s) of college advisement. (Refer to Preplanning Guide 3.)
Step 4: Identification of Decision Makers

The identification of the decision makers within the preplanning effort is crucial in focusing the preplanning stage. It is necessary to explicate who will have the legal authority to make decisions, as well as to whom responsibility for decision making will be delegated. Also, it is necessary to identify those individuals or groups who in some way may influence decision making.

A critical skill for a department chairperson is the ability to formulate decisions consistent with the purpose(s) of college advisement. An effective chairperson, however, need not assume total responsibility for decision making. The responsibility for decision making could conceivably be shared and delegated among faculty advisors who could be allowed the flexibility to contribute to the decision making process, perhaps through the inception of a joint committee. Representative student advisees could conceivably be delegated some of this responsibility where deemed appropriate. Department chairpersons might be cautioned, however, to assume the ultimate responsibility for making final decisions, based on the recommendations of the joint committee. Delegating and entrusting responsibility for decision making to faculty advisors could be viewed as critical activities in securing the cooperation of faculty members and subsequently achieving the anticipated goals of the advisement process.
Step 5: Identification of the Information Recipients

The audiences or individuals to whom the evaluation information is to be provided comprise the evaluation recipients. A concise but comprehensive statement describing the audiences will suffice. This should include the number of persons, educational or administrative level, the levels of information to which they will have access, and any other relevant information; for example, "Those persons who will receive the evaluation information will include the department chairperson, departmental administrators, faculty advisors, and student advisees participating in the process of college advisement." (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 3)

Step 6: Determination and Prioritization of Goals and Objectives

The foundation of the process of college advisement is portrayed in the goals of the advisement process. Practical and justifiable goals afford direction to the advisement process. Advisement goals are developed through an analysis of (a) the purpose(s) of the advisement process, (b) the individuals to be served by the advisement process, and (c) the rationale for advisement. A program goal has been conceptualized as a statement of broad direction and general purpose without reference to time or definite behavior.

The development of suitable goals and objectives might best be accomplished through a shared effort by administrators, faculty advisors, and student advisees. The goals of college advisement typically illustrate the needs addressed by advisement. In turn, the
objectives of college advisement directly relate to a stated goal. Objectives are typically subdivided into management or staff (process) objectives and client performance (outcome) objectives. A program objective has been conceptualized as a statement which describes particular activities and behaviors.

The goals of the college advisement process could be rank ordered from most to least important, utilizing some method of prioritization. Available methods of ranking items include a modified Delphi technique, a modified Phi Delta Kappa technique, and a frequency count ranking technique. Other methods, however, may also be employed.

The Delphi technique (Abedor, 1972) is a procedure utilized to acquire consensus on selected developmental goals, priorities, or other items through anonymous interaction of respondents. A panel of experts are mailed a questionnaire to which they respond independently. A follow-up questionnaire is then compiled in which a summary of the original responses is reported, utilizing descriptive statistics, specifically the median and interquartile range, for the responses to each original question (Borich, 1974). Panel members are given an opportunity to reconsider their initial responses and to revise any. Second responses still outside the interquartile range, which encompasses the majority judgment, require justification. This procedure is repeated a third time and if necessary several more times until consensus is ultimately attained.

The Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) technique, developed at the Northern California Program Development Center, entails three stages:
(a) rating goals according to perceived importance and degree of achievement, (b) determining objectives developed through high priority rankings, and (c) formulating objectives and plans for implementation.

The frequency count ranking technique (Van Adestine, 1978) simply involves the construction of a group list of items specified from the lists of respondents within a group, and disclosing the number of times each item was presented.

Faculty advisor objectives. Faculty advisor objectives may be developed to facilitate the ascertainment of advisor responsibilities and performance dimensions to further the attainment of overall goals and the achievement of desired advisee performance. Examples of faculty advisor objectives identified in the literature include the following three role requirements of the faculty advisor: (a) to demonstrate a concern for and knowledge of the institutional and departmental purposes and the manner in which those purposes are used for the student's education, (b) to demonstrate an understanding of the fact that the student's goals are a blend of many personal and external factors, and (c) to facilitate the student's learning through personal contacts with the student (Hardee, 1970). (Refer to Pre-planning Guide 3.) The Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl (1964) handbooks on the classification of educational objectives can be of considerable assistance in the conceptualization and development of performance objectives appropriate for faculty advisors.

Student advisee objectives. These performance objectives comprise a communication design for describing in explicit operational
terms the intended terminal advisee behavior. It has been documented in the literature that the responsibility of the faculty advisor is to "advise" while it is the responsibility of the student advisee to take advantage of that service. Presumably this "advice" may be respected or ignored at the discretion of the advisee; however, this preference has seldom prevailed. Under most circumstances, advisees have perceived the advisor as the controlling agent in the advisement relationship and as having the sole responsibility in the decision making process, regardless of efforts on the part of the advisor to conscientiously advise and to have the advisee assume the responsibility for decisions (Crookston, 1972). Again, the Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl (1964) taxonomies of educational objectives can be utilized to conceptualize and specify performance objectives appropriate for student advisees.

**Purpose(s) of goals and objectives.** Goals and objectives are developed for the purpose of aiming faculty advisor behavior toward expected outcomes. It is assumed that through establishing goals and objectives faculty advisors and student advisees will perform more competently if they are aware of, comprehend, and comply with what is anticipated from them. The growth and development of those individuals involved in the preplanning process can be facilitated by determining goals and objectives. It is the responsibility of the administration or the department chairperson to confer with the faculty advisors, and ideally representative student advisees when appropriate, in setting the goals and objectives of the advisement process.
Hamet (1974) suggested that goals which are "established at the top echelon of an organization and are filtered down and back up the organizational structure" facilitate the development of a strong supportive structure (p. 66). This process formulates goals that more closely correlate with the individual needs, goals, and personalities of the faculty advisors and student advisees. Hamet (1974, p. 66) depicted the goals setting-feedback process in the following flow diagram.

Goals Setting-Feedback Process Flow Diagram

Top administration sets preliminary goals

Review and modify goals with staff
(vertical and horizontal communication)

Establish measurable objectives for each goal with staff member

Recycle goals and objectives frequently

This management model assumes that effective department chairpersons share in the preplanning stage with faculty advisors through an interchange of ideas. Communication of ideas between faculty advisors is also critical. Better results could conceivably be expected if faculty advisors and, where appropriate, student advisees are allowed input in the process of setting goals and objectives.
Step 7: Establishment of Monitoring Policies

Monitoring is a continuous process in which each preceding step that has been completed is reviewed to decide if modifications are required before proceeding to the next step.

Step 8: Establishment of Monitoring Procedures

The procedures for monitoring each step have been conceptualized as consisting of the following three components: (a) a review and analysis of the plans, programs, or consequences of each prior step with the appropriate individuals; (b) a decision whether to monitor any of the steps; and (c) a decision to proceed to the following step. The accompanying flow chart is a graphic illustration which demonstrates how the monitoring procedures in the preplanning phase of an evaluation of the college advisement process flow systematically from step to step.

Step 9: Selection of Potential Alternative Courses of Action and Procedures to Accomplish the Goals

This step in the preplanning process consists of listing viable alternatives for achieving the goals of college advisement. An appropriate technique which can readily be utilized to produce alternatives is simply a brainstorming session in which all ideas are recorded.
Monitoring the Preplanning Steps Flow Chart

- Prepare needs assessment
- Describe rationale for college advisement
- Determine discrepancy indicating a need to modify
  - If YES
    - Expand (add)
  - If NO discrepancy, retain and continue to next step
    - Condense (subtract)
    - Substitute (different)
    - Rearrange (interchange)
    - Synthesize (combine)
    - Transfer (other uses)
    - Delete (dismiss)
Step 10: Determination of the Best Alternative(s) to Achieve the Goals

The process of college advisement by faculty members is one of the many alternatives available to an institution of higher education to assist students with their educational, personal, and vocational concerns (Bogard et al., 1977). The literature abounds with illustrations of effective advisement systems (Levine & Weingart, 1973), new plans that meet changing student needs (Shepard, 1974), and new combinations of existing faculties and functions (Dameron & Wolf, 1974; Ender, 1975; Sheffield & Meskill, 1972).

The department chairperson, either singly or cooperatively with faculty advisors, and possibly with representative student advisees, will require a decision making technique with which to discern the most acceptable alternative(s). One such procedure to identify the best alternative(s) for conducting the process of college advisement is the utilization of a matrix worksheet. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 4 and Preplanning Guide 4 Example Worksheet.)

Step 11: Determination and Description of Contingency Measures

The identification of foreseeable problems and contingency methods is an important step in the preplanning process. It is imperative that the decision makers think about and specify the contingency provisions prior to the possible occurrence of potential problems. Again, a simple brainstorming session could be conducted to consider all the possible problems that might evolve and to also
discuss feasible solutions for each problem.

One technique with which to determine the most appropriate solution(s) for each problem is the Q-methodology. Stephenson (1953) developed the Q-methodology which is a technique utilized for evaluating needs and objectives. According to Borich (1974), the Q-sort can be utilized in the collection of "appraisal or judgmental data from relevant groups of persons on . . . stated needs or objectives" (p. 284). In short, a list of the potential solutions to each problem would be assigned numerals, written on cards, and distributed to decision makers to rank order according to some predetermined rules. For example, the individuals might be asked to sort the cards according to whether they thought the solutions on them were practical or impractical for each problem. Borich further specified that techniques like the Q-sort are "essential in predevelopmental and objectives formative evaluation" (p. 284).

Step 12: Identification of Constraints on the Evaluator and the Evaluation

Frequently, the evaluation personnel must operate within already established constraints which may create problems within the preplanning process. For example, access to data sources, such as records, files, or even advisors and advisees, may be limited. Consequently, it is crucial that the decision makers identify the freedoms and constraints with which the evaluator must contend, and attempt to make necessary revisions if required. Regardless of the restrictions, care must be taken to secure adequate access to data.
sources and to provide alternative sources when needed. Again, an initial brainstorming session coupled with a Q-sort could be utilized to satisfy the preplanning needs of the evaluator.

Step 13: Identification of the Evaluator(s)

The identification of the evaluator(s) is another crucial step in focusing the organization of the preplanning process. It is necessary to identify who has the authority to evaluate, as well as to whom responsibility for the varied activities within the preplanning stage is delegated. This task clarifies for everyone involved with preplanning exactly who does what, and in what role or capacity. It might also be wise to consider the probability that the involvement of an external evaluator serving in the capacity of consultant would reduce inherent bias in the preplanning process and also increase the credibility of the final evaluation reports.

Step 14: Establishment of a Feasible Timetable

It is the responsibility of the evaluator(s) and the decision makers to cooperatively organize the scheduling limitations to facilitate decisions to be made and the timing needs of the evaluation audiences. This process could be achieved by recording the events and activities necessary to attain a goal together with the starting and completion dates. It is important that a feasible timetable be established to alert all those individuals and groups involved in the preplanning process to when each of the components of the process must be completed. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 5,
Step 15: Establishment of a Preliminary Budget

A budget is a preplanning tool which facilitates the allocation of funds or resources and the decisions regarding costs of requisite human and material resources. The budget, therefore, establishes the amount of support and the sources of available funds or resources needed to organize and operationalize the preplanning stage. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 7 and Preplanning Guide 7 Example Worksheet.)

Step 16: Establishment of Reporting Policies

Reporting is a continuous process and it is the responsibility of the decision makers within the preplanning process to determine with whom to communicate and the methods and means with which to disseminate pertinent information. The following set of questions, which is a modification of the works of Hamet (1974) and Stufflebeam (1971), is not intended to specify guidelines to implement the reporting process, but simply to present questions and considerations within the communication process. The considerations include:

1. What do we want to communicate?
2. With whom do we want to communicate?
3. For what reason or purpose do we want to communicate the information?
4. When is the best time(s) to communicate the information?
5. Where will we communicate the information, and to how many persons?

6. What communication technique will we utilize to communicate the information?

7. Who will assume the responsibility for formulating and delivering the information?

8. How will we finance the costs incurred, and are sufficient funds available to implement what is planned?

Step 17: Establishment of Reporting Procedures

The dissemination of pertinent information is also an important phase in the preplanning process since it facilitates understanding and support for the process of college advisement. Interpersonal (face-to-face) communication is an effective mode of communication which could be utilized in the dissemination phase. Interpersonal communication incorporates the following methods: conferences, demonstrations, seminars, telephoning, two or more people interchanging comments, workshops, and others. Because of its nature, face-to-face communication provides opportunities for immediate response or feedback from recipients.

As indicated earlier, the communication and dissemination process is continuous. Within this process the procedures for communication and dissemination of evaluation information have been conceptualized as consisting of the following three phases: (a) early communication, (b) infrequent and periodic communication, and (c) dissemination of the final report(s) after the completion of the
preplanning investigation. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guides 8 and 9.)

Step 18: Assessment of the Preplanning Steps

Before developing and implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement, it is important to first assess each of the preplanning steps and to make any necessary modifications. This process serves a controlling function in the preplanning stage and helps ensure success of the evaluation effort. (Refer to Section 2, Preplanning Guide 10.)

Summary of Preplanning Procedures

Section 1 has presented a narrative description of the procedural guidelines incorporated in the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the college advisement process. An evaluation cannot be conducted appropriately without first knowing the basic elements of the process of college advisement. Meaningful evaluation of college advisement cannot occur until the purpose for, and components of, the advisement process are defined.

Educational evaluation is performed in the service of decision making; therefore, it should provide information which is useful to decision makers either for drawing conclusions or projecting future actions (Stufflebeam, 1976). For the purposes of monitoring the process of college advisement and the subsequent provision of information on needed change, an evaluation model must be identified and implemented. The CIPP Model is an appropriate evaluation model which...
could provide continuous and systematic evaluation. The utilization of the CIPP Model could contribute to the selection of objectives, thereby fulfilling the requisite of accountability through a report of the objectives selected and the rationale for their inclusion. In other words, after the preplanning stage of evaluation has been completed, an evaluation design such as the CIPP Model can be utilized to gather and supply information for decision making and ascertaining through a multitude of activities and events whether the process of college advisement is on target. (Refer to Preplanning Guide 11.)

Section 2: Preplanning Guides (Illustrations)

This section consists of illustrations of the following guides which can be used in conjunction with the steps previously described:

3. Preplanning Guide 3—Goal Setting Worksheet to Develop a Broad Conceptualization of College Advisement.
5. Preplanning Guide 5—Preplanning Activities Timeline and Example Worksheet.
7. Preplanning Guide 7—Budget Worksheet and Example Worksheet.

PREPLANNING GUIDE 1

Preplanning Steps Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preplanning Steps</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of a needs assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the rationale for college advisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definition of the purpose(s) of college advisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of the decision makers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identification of the information recipients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Determination and prioritization of the goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establishment of the monitoring policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establishment of the monitoring procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Selection of the alternative courses of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Determination of the best alternative(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Determination and description of the contingency measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Identification of the constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Identification of the evaluator(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Establishment of a preliminary budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preplanning Steps</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Establishment of the reporting policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Establishment of the reporting procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Assessment of the preplanning steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functions of the College Advisement Process (Structure of System)

- Definition of college advisement
- Nature and purpose of higher education
- Enrollment procedures
- Number of faculty
- Number of student advisees
- Goals and values pertaining to the process of college advisement
- Availability of human resources
- Availability of material resources
- Availability of financial resources
- Institutional procedures, policies, and requisites
- Natural adjunct to the teaching responsibility
- Planning
- Monitoring and evaluation of educational progress
- Coordinate the total educational experience
- Accountability

Dimensions of the College Advisement Process (Types of Advisement)

- Academic advisement
- Personal counseling
- Career counseling
- Career planning
- Educational programming
- Educational and career options

Roles of the College Advisor (Duties)

- Supplying advisement information to advisees
- Situational
- Educational leader
- Clarification of needs
- Exercise of authority
- Institutional representative
- Expert
- Adult
- Friend
- Judge
- Diversified
- Source of strength and continuity for students
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Professional Competencies of the College Advisor (Expertise)

Skills in problem solving  
Skills in decision making  
Skills in evaluation  
Integrating institution's many resources  
Transmission of knowledge  
Knowledge of institutional/departmental procedures and policies  
Ability to refer students to correct resources  
Information on vocational and career plans  
Concern for student's academic progress  
Ability to help student define and develop realistic goals  
Ability to match needs with appropriate institutional resources  
Training in/experience with advisement techniques  
Years of teaching experience  

Personal Competencies of the College Advisor (Characteristics)

Sensitivity to human needs  
Ability to perceive needs accurately  
Commitment to advise  
Empathy  
Warmth  
Genuineness  
Unbiased  
Interest in student's welfare  
Friendly  
Alert  
Sympathy  

Communication Processes in the College Advisement Process (Interaction)

Behavioral awareness  
Environmental and interpersonal interactions  
Listening to problems  
Negotiation  
Watching  
Feeling  
Inquiring  
Respecting  
Offering advice  
Establishing rapport  
Cooperative exploration  
Placing responsibility upon the student to make decisions  
Self-disclosure  
Concreteness  
Interpersonal
Advisor/Advisee Relationships (Interpersonal)

Amount of informal interaction between advisor and advisee
Selection and/or assignment of advisees
Advisee load
Teaching load
Personal competencies
Student advisee's goals
Number and length of advisement sessions
Advisee's perceptions of an ideal advisor
Advisor's self-perceptions of an ideal advisor
Student advisee's needs
Sharing of information
Personal privacy
Close
Trusting
Satisfying
Enduring
Goal Setting Worksheet to Develop a Board Conceptualization of College Advisement

Directions (Steps): (1) Describe the rationale for college advisement; (2) Define the purpose(s) of college advisement; (3) Identify the information recipients; and (4) Determine the goals of college advisement.

Rationale for College Advisement (Reasons for developing and implementing the advisement process):

Purpose(s) of College Advisement (What functions advisement is intended to fulfill):

Information Recipients (Who will receive the evaluation information):

List Goals of College Advisement (Expected outcomes of the advisement process):
**Problem Solving—Decision Making Matrix Worksheet**

**Directions (Steps):**
1. Define and record the problem;
2. Define and record the goal;
3. Formulate and record the alternative course of action;
4. Formulate and record value items (i.e., fundamental goals, objectives, or events);
5. Weight the significance of the value items from 1 to 10 (1 is lowest and 10 is highest);
6. Sum the weights and multiply by 5 to calculate the ideal score;
7. Score each value item for each alternative from 1 to 5 based on the degree to which the alternative includes or helps each value item (1 is lowest and 5 is highest);
8. Multiply the score for each alternative listed in Step #7 by the weight for each value item listed in Step #5; and
9. Select the best alternative or highest scored alternative.

**Problem:**

______________________________

**Goal:**

______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Items</th>
<th>Item Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total weight x 5 = ideal score**

**Best Alternative:**

______________________________

---

1 Adapted from Hamet (1974).
Problem Solving—Decision Making Matrix

Problem: No advisement offered to facilitate job selection and placement of undergraduate seniors.

Goal: To provide career planning and career counseling services to undergraduate seniors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Items</th>
<th>Advisors Assume Responsibility</th>
<th>Counselors Assume Responsibility</th>
<th>Instructors Assume Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Item Weights</td>
<td>wt. wt.sc.</td>
<td>wt. wt.sc.</td>
<td>wt. wt.sc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify job interests in undergraduate seniors</td>
<td>10 5 (50)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer seniors to resources which provide job information</td>
<td>10 4 (40)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer seniors to resources which provide job orientation sessions</td>
<td>9 5 (45)</td>
<td>5 (45)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer seniors to resources which arrange job interviews</td>
<td>8 5 (40)</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer seniors to resources which provide a list of available jobs</td>
<td>9 5 (45)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer seniors to resources which contact potential employers for jobs</td>
<td>8 5 (40)</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up of seniors on jobs</td>
<td>8 5 (40)</td>
<td>4 (32)</td>
<td>2 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scores</td>
<td>62 x 5 = 310</td>
<td>(242)</td>
<td>(169)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Alternative: Advisor Assumes Responsibility
Preplanning Activities Timeline

**Directions:** This worksheet is to be utilized to indicate the activities for preplanning. A single (X) indicates the activity will occur during only one month. A series of (X)s indicates the activity will occur continuously.

**Evaluation Title:** __________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preplanning Activities</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**PREPLANNING GUIDE 5 EXAMPLE WORKSHEET**

**Preplanning Activities Timeline**

**Evaluation Title:** Preplanning an Evaluation of the College Advisement Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preplanning Activities</th>
<th>Timeline (dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of a needs assessment.</td>
<td>XX X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the rationale for college advisement.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definition of the purpose(s) of college advisement.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of the decision makers.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identification of the information recipients.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Determination and prioritization of the goals and objectives.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring the preplanning activities.</td>
<td>XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Report to the decision makers.</td>
<td>XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Report to the audiences.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incomplete.*
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# PREPLANNING GUIDE 6

## Weekly Record of Evaluation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities That Must Occur</th>
<th>Necessary or Anticipated Experiences</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Target Date for Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and duplication/binding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Budget Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel (26,208)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) Associate Professor. Time commitment--30%/30 wks., 100%/10 wks. To coordinate the preplanning effort, contact participants, arrange schedules, and develop materials. To assist in data collection and writing the final evaluation report.</td>
<td>$12,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) doctoral level student at $7.80/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 48 wks. To assist in data collection.</td>
<td>7,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) consultant from Evaluation Center at $100/day x 8 days. To evaluate the goals of the college advisement process, monitor time schedules and data collection procedures. To complete data analysis and to assist in writing final evaluation report.</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) part-time secretary at $4.75/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 52 wks. To maintain appropriate records, prepare communication, and assist in other clerical tasks.</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies (200)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (406)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and duplication/binding</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer time</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional supplies</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$26,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREPLANNING GUIDE 8

Communication Matrix Worksheet

Directions (Steps): (1) Record persons or audiences with whom to communicate; (2) Record methods of communication and a tentative schedule, i.e., conferences (in­frequent), informal conversations (frequent), memo (periodic), newsletter (monthly), staff meetings (weekly), and telephone (frequent); and (3) Mark an X in each appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons or Audiences With Whom to Communicate</th>
<th>Methods of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Refer to Section 1, Step 17: Establishment of Reporting Procedures, page 99.
Dissemination Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipients of information</td>
<td>Information to be disseminated</td>
<td>Methods to be used in dissemination</td>
<td>Who will develop delivery system for dissemination</td>
<td>How information will be delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Assessing Preplanning Steps Checklist

**Directions:** The following list comprises those questions for which answers must be provided to effectively monitor the preplanning effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a rationale been provided for the process of college advisement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the purpose of college advisement been stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the purpose of departmental advisement been presented to the (a) administration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) faculty advisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) student advisees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) evaluation personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the roles of persons to be directly involved in the preplanning stage been defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the roles of persons to be indirectly involved in the preplanning stage been defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the roles been designed to accomplish the goals of the preplanning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the responsibilities of persons to be directly involved in the preplanning stage been defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the responsibilities of persons to be indirectly involved in the preplanning stage been defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the responsibilities been designed to accomplish the goals of the preplanning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have goals for advisement been established?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have criteria been established for each goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have adequate provisions been made for monitoring to determine the adequacy of each preplanning step?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative plans for the creation of alternative courses of action been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative plans for the selection of the best alternative(s) been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative plans for the identification of potential problems been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative plans for the determination of causes of potential problems been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have constraints to be placed on the evaluator been identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have constraints to be placed on the preplanning process been identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there people available to develop the preplanning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there people available to conduct the preplanning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there people available to interpret the results of the preplanning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a feasible timetable for implementing each of the steps in the preplanning process been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a preliminary budget for implementing each of the steps in the preplanning process been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has it been determined to whom reports will be disseminated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has it been determined when reports will be disseminated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative procedures for communicating and disseminating evaluation information been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have tentative plans for appropriately implementing the procedures for communicating and disseminating evaluation information been developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The CIPP Evaluation Model: A Classification Scheme of Strategies for Evaluating Educational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To define the operation context, to identify and assess needs in the context, and to identify and delineate problems underlying the needs.</td>
<td>To identify and analyze system capabilities, input strategies, and design for implementing the strategies.</td>
<td>To identify or predict, in process, defects in the procedural design or its implementation and to maintain a record of procedural events and activities.</td>
<td>To relate outcome information to objectives and to context, input, and process information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Context Evaluation
- **Objectives**: By describing individually and in relevant perspectives the major subsystems of the context, by comparing actual and intended inputs and outputs of the subsystems and by analyzing possible causes of discrepancies between actual and intended inputs and outputs.
- **Input Evaluation**: By describing and analyzing available human and material resources, solution strategies, and procedural designs for relevance, feasibility, and economy in the course of action to be taken.
- **Process Evaluation**: By monitoring the activities, potential procedural barriers, and remaining alert to unanticipated ones, and by interpreting the outcomes associated with predetermined standards or comparison bases, and by comparing actual and intended inputs and outputs.
- **Product Evaluation**: By defining operationally and measuring criteria associated with the objectives, by comparing these measurements with predetermined standards or comparison bases, and by interpreting the outcome in terms of recorded input and process information.
### The Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For deciding upon the setting to be served, the goals associated with meeting needs and objectives associated with solving problems, i.e., for planning needed changes</td>
<td>For selecting sources of support, solution strategies, and procedural designs, i.e., for programming change activities</td>
<td>For implementing and refining the program design and procedures, i.e., for effecting process control</td>
<td>For deciding to continue, terminate, modify or refocus a change activity, and for linking the activity to other major phases of the change process, i.e., for evolving change activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Stufflebeam (1971)
In order to establish validity of the procedural guidelines within the context of preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement, four judges (two who were experts in evaluation and two who were experts in advisement) were requested to respond to a series of questions representing the standards for judging the validity of the guidelines. The judges were asked to answer either "Yes" or "No" to questions on the Criteria Sheet which was designed to provide a measure of the technical adequacy, utility, and practicality of the guidelines according to specific criteria (Appendix C). Further reactions were also elicited from the judges pertaining to suggested additions and/or deletions within the preplanning steps, comprehensiveness of the guidelines, and clarity of directions for completing the task.

Because of the somewhat arbitrary nature involved in setting criterion measures, and also of the diversity in expertise of the four judges, no specific criterion level was established to indicate validity. Rather, analyses of percentages of agreement, nonagreement, and no response were utilized to obtain an indication of the validity of the guidelines.

Nine questions were considered by Judge A (evaluation expert) to be questions "someone with advisement expertise will have to answer" and were thus not answered. These questions consisted of one question under Technical Adequacy (1. Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement?), four
questions under Utility (7. Would utilization of the guidelines be time efficient? 8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient? 10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design? and 11. Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?), and four questions under Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results? 20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole? 21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement? and 22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?).

Two questions were left unanswered by Judge B (evaluation expert), one each under Technical Adequacy (3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?) and Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?).

Judge C (advisement expert) did not answer six questions, four under Utility (6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete? 8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient? 10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation
of any evaluation design? and 14. Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?) and two under Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results? and 22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?). Judge C found himself "needing the opportunity to either expound on my answer or to ask for an opinion before responding with a straight 'yes' or 'no'."

Judge D (advisement expert) responded to all the questions with either a "Yes" or "No."

Data obtained from the judges were analyzed in several ways to provide some indication of the validity of the Preplanning Guidelines:

1. Percentage of agreement among the judges on the Technical Adequacy, Utility, and Practicality of the Guidelines.

2. Percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question among the four judges.

3. Percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question between the advisement experts.

4. Percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question between the evaluation experts.

Table 1 presents the first of these analyses. As illustrated in this table, the total percentage of agreement among judges on individual standards was highest for Technical Adequacy (60%), followed
Table 1
Percentage of Agreement Among Judges on Validity of Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical Adequacy (n = 5)</th>
<th>Utility (n = 11)</th>
<th>Practicality (n = 6)</th>
<th>Total (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge A</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
<td>0/11 (0%)</td>
<td>1/6 (17%)</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge B</td>
<td>2/5 (40%)</td>
<td>5/11 (45%)</td>
<td>2/6 (33%)</td>
<td>(39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisement Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge C</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
<td>4/11 (36%)</td>
<td>3/6 (50%)</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge D</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
<td>9/11 (82%)</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(46%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = Number of items on Criteria Sheet.

n/n = Number of responses in agreement/number of items on Criteria Sheet.
by Practicality (46%), and then Utility (40%). Comparison of total percentage of agreement between evaluation experts and advisement experts indicated diverse opinions regarding the validity of the guidelines. As illustrated in Table 1, the total percentage of agreement between evaluation experts was 32% and 39%, respectively, whereas the total percentage of agreement between advisement experts was 49% and 75%, respectively. Even within the two areas of expertise, evaluation and advisement, one of the two judges viewed the guidelines as being more valid. Further analysis of percentage of agreement between evaluation experts (35.5%) and advisement experts (62%) suggested that both advisement experts considered the guidelines, in general, to exhibit more validity than did the two evaluation experts.

Analysis of percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response did not appear to indicate any consistent pattern in responses to individual questions within each standard. This lack of consistency, however, could conceivably be attributed to the fact that three of the four judges (two evaluation experts and one advisement expert) did not respond with a "Yes" or "No" to all of the questions as requested. The questions left unanswered by the judges are indicated under the heading of "No Response" in each of the tables.

In Table 2, although inconsistencies in agreement per question among the four judges were reported, specific questions within each standard indicated stronger agreement. Two questions from each of the three standards indicated 75% agreement (4. Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined? 5. Is the purpose of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the purpose of the guidelines clearly defined?</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would utilization of the guidelines be time efficient?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Nonagreement</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage?</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do the guidelines facilitate the attainment of consensus from the persons to be involved regarding goals and programs to accomplish the goals?</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation?</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
<td>1/4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information?</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Utility—Continued

16. Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences? 3/4 (75%) 1/4 (25%) -- --

Practicality

17. Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities? 1/4 (25%) 3/4 (75%) -- --

18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? (Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?) 1/4 (25%) -- -- 3/4 (75%)

19. Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation? 3/4 (75%) 1/4 (25%) -- --

20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole? 2/4 (50%) 1/4 (25%) 1/4 (25%)

21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement? 3/4 (75%) -- -- 1/4 (25%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicality--Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guidelines clearly defined? 9. Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage? 16. Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences? 19. Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation? and 21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement?).

One question from Technical Adequacy (2. Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies?) and one question from Practicality (17. Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities?) indicated 75% nonagreement. Only one question from Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?) was left unanswered by 75% of the judges.

In Table 3, specific questions within each standard indicated stronger agreement between the two advisement experts. One hundred percent agreement was reported for one question from Technical Adequacy (4. Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined?). One hundred percent agreement was also reported for four questions from Utility (9. Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage? 13. Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation? 15. Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Adequacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies?</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the purpose of the guidelines clearly defined?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would utilization of the guidelines be <strong>time</strong> efficient?</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would utilization of the guidelines be <strong>cost</strong> efficient?</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 3
Percentage of Agreement, Nonagreement, and No Response Per Question Between Advisement Experts on Review Criteria

---

...
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do the guidelines facilitate the attainment of consensus from the persons to be involved regarding goals and programs to accomplish the goals?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Nonagreement</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? (Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality--Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information? and 16. Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences?). Three questions from Practicality (19. Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation? 20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole? and 21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement?) indicated 100% agreement between the advisement experts.

One hundred percent nonagreement was reported for two questions from Technical Adequacy (2. Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies? and 3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?) and only one question from Utility (7. Would utilization of the guidelines be time efficient?).

Four questions from Utility (6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete? 8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient? 10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design? and 14. Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?) were left unanswered by one of the two judges. Two questions from Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results? and 22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which
college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?) were also left unanswered by one of the two judges.

Inconsistencies were again reported in Table 4; however, only one question from Technical Adequacy (5. Is the purpose of the guidelines clearly defined?) indicated 100% agreement between the two evaluation experts. One hundred percent nonagreement was reported for three questions from Utility (6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete? 13. Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation? and 15. Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information?). One hundred percent nonagreement was reported for only one question from Practicality (17. Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities?).

Only one question from Practicality (18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?) was left unanswered by both of the judges. At least one of the two judges, however, failed to respond to a total of nine questions. Two questions from Technical Adequacy (1. Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement? and 3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?) were left unanswered. One judge failed to respond to four questions from Utility (7. Would utilization of the
Table 4
Percentage of Agreement, Nonagreement, and No Response Per Question Between Evaluation Experts on Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the purpose of the guidelines clearly defined?</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would utilization of the guidelines be time efficient?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do the guidelines facilitate the attainment of consensus from the persons to be involved regarding goals and programs to accomplish the goals?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Nonagreement</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the preplanning stage? (Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Nonagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 (50%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guidelines is time efficient? 8. Would utilization of the guidelines be cost efficient? 10. Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design? and 11. Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?). Three questions from Practicality (20. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning an evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole? 21. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in preplanning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement? and 22. Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?) were also left unanswered by one of the two evaluation experts.

**Summary**

Validity data were presented for "The Procedural Guidelines for Preplanning an Evaluation of College Advisement." Four expert judges, two with advisement expertise and two with evaluation expertise, responded to a series of questions representing the standards of Technical Adequacy, Utility, and Practicality in order to determine the validity of the procedural guidelines. No specific criterion level was used to indicate validity. However, validity results were presented showing (a) the total percentage of agreement among the four judges; (b) the total percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question among the four judges; (c) the percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question between the
advisement experts; and (d) the percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question between the evaluation experts.

The total percentage of agreement among the four judges on individual standards indicated a stronger agreement in the Technical Adequacy standard, followed by Practicality and Utility, respectively. In addition, percentage of agreement between evaluation experts and advisement experts suggested that both advisement experts viewed the guidelines, in general, as exhibiting more validity than did the two evaluation experts.

Responses among the four judges to individual questions within each standard were inconsistent. Seventy-five percent agreement was reported on two questions from each of the three standards. Seventy-five percent nonagreement was reported for only two questions, one each from Technical Adequacy and Practicality, respectively. In addition, 75% of the judges failed to respond to one question from Practicality.

Responses between the advisement experts to individual questions within each standard were also inconsistent. One question from Technical Adequacy, four questions from Utility, and three questions from Practicality received 100% agreement. Two questions from Technical Adequacy and one question from Utility received 100% nonagreement. One of the two judges failed to respond to six questions, four from Utility and two from Practicality.

Inconsistent responses between the two evaluation experts to individual questions within each standard were also reported. Only one question from Technical Adequacy received 100% agreement. Three
questions from Utility and only one question from Practicality received 100% nonagreement. Both judges failed to respond to one question from Practicality, whereas nine questions, two from Technical Adequacy, four from Utility, and three from Practicality, were left unanswered by one of the judges.

Based on the percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question among the judges on the validity of the guidelines, analyses of the results indicate inconsistent findings pertaining to the validity of the guidelines. However, because three of the four judges failed to respond to each question, it is difficult at this time to establish conclusively whether the guidelines provide a systematic way of approaching the preplanning considerations of college advisement.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND MODIFICATIONS

Since proponents of higher education are now beginning to integrate interpersonal skills with intellectual development, it follows that there is urgent need for continuous and systematic educational advisement to successfully guide the learner toward maximum development in his/her selective field. The utilization of faculty members can contribute significantly to the facilitation of this desired integration between the personal and intellectual development of students. In order to attain the highest degree of benefit, however, there must be some well-reasoned and tested methods of utilizing the advisement process.

There does not appear in the literature to be any prevalent method of systematic educational evaluation pertaining to the process of college advisement, nor does college advisement appear to have specific boundaries. This lack of specificity thus supports the need for evaluating the process of college advisement.

Educational evaluation, however, has often been portrayed as comprising the two components of planning and implementation of the process. A primary activity generally excluded from evaluation procedures is preplanning—establishing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to develop evaluation. This situation has prevailed with the process of college advisement. Before one can consider evaluating the college advisement process, one must first
stipulate what advisement entails, with regard to the purpose(s) and components or parameters. To facilitate such an evaluation, explicit preplanning procedures are a requisite.

This investigation has described the development and validation of procedural guidelines with which to systematically approach the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement. The guidelines were designed to be (a) applicable to either the college advisement process as a whole or to certain specific aspects of advisement, and (b) used within a setting in which the college advisement process is already established and functioning. The guidelines are not intended to specify an evaluation methodology for college advisement. The purpose is to present a comprehensive list of considerations and activities which will provide an information base sufficient to guide evaluation of the process of college advisement. Then, if necessary, an evaluation of the advisement process can be initiated utilizing appropriate models of evaluation, such as the DEM and CIPP models.

The guidelines were reviewed by a panel of expert judges to determine the validity of the preplanning evaluation procedures. The percentage of agreement among the judges on the validity of the guidelines was obtained. The percentage of agreement, nonagreement, and no response per question in determining the validity of the guidelines was also obtained (a) among the four judges, (b) between the two advisement experts, and (c) between the two evaluation experts.
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The total percentage of agreement among the four judges on individual standards indicated the strongest agreement for Technical Adequacy (60%), followed by Practicality (46%) and Utility (40%), respectively. Analysis of percentage of agreement between evaluation and advisement experts suggested that the guidelines were viewed as exhibiting more validity by the advisement experts than by the evaluation experts.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following limitations and assumptions were inherent in this investigation:

1. Large-scale field tests of educational products in natural school settings are both time consuming and expensive. Given these major limitations, it was not feasible to plan and execute a large-scale field test of the procedural guidelines with which to preplan an evaluation of the process of college advisement. Brickell and Aslanian (1974) suggested that, "before an evaluator decides to conduct a full-scale formal field test of a product, he should consider some of the alternatives" (p. 7). Furthermore, "it happens fairly frequently that field testing is premature and that an acceptable low-cost alternative can be used instead" (Brickell & Aslanian, 1974, p. 7). It was assumed, therefore, that a suitable alternative would be to utilize a review panel of judges to determine the validity of the preplanning evaluation procedures (Bunda, Note 6).

2. The procedures used are intended to serve as guidelines with which to systematically approach an evaluation of the advisement
process. The steps, however, do not constitute an invariant model. Therefore, it was assumed that not everyone who reads them will necessarily concur with everything proposed. In view of this, the guidelines are designed to provide practical suggestions and meaningful information and direction concerning the preplanning stage of an evaluation of the college advisement process.

3. Because this investigation involved both the processes of college advisement and educational evaluation, it was deemed appropriate to select as judges for the review panel experts in both fields. It was assumed, therefore, that varying results would be obtained between the two sets of judges because of the diversity of expertise.

4. A further limitation related to the use of a review panel was the selection of only four judges. There did not appear to be evident in the literature any documentation pertaining to a desirable number of judges serving on a review panel. Therefore, it was assumed that, because of the nature of this initial validation attempt, four judges was an appropriate number of individuals to serve as expert reviewers.

5. The "Criteria Sheet for Review Panel of Judges" was designed to elicit either a "Yes" or "No" response. By not including a "No Response" column, it was assumed that the judges would be forced to respond one way or the other. Three of the four judges, however, elected not to answer all the questions either "Yes" or "No" and included a third column of their own labeled "?." These missing data lend support to the fact that the results obtained from the
judges are inconclusive regarding the validity of the guidelines.

6. When each of the judges was approached to participate in the validation phase of this investigation, each agreed to complete the task. However, each individual expressed concern over the amount of time needed to review and judge the guidelines and cautioned that each had several other commitments. Because the validation process occurred at the end of the summer semester the judges were involved with end-of-term matters and busily preparing for the start of the fall semester. It was assumed, therefore, that perhaps the guidelines had not received the full attention of the judges during the review process. This assumption was supported by a comment from one of the judges who reported that, "In all honesty their perusal deserves a great deal more time—in concentrated blocks—than I have been able to give them at this most hectic time of the year."

Conclusions

In view of the stated objectives and based upon the results obtained in this investigation, several conclusions were drawn. The first four conclusions were based upon a review of the literature. It was concluded that:

1. Previous research investigating the utilization of any existing plan of systematic educational evaluation within the context of the process of college advisement does not appear to be available.

2. Writers in the area of education evaluation focus primarily on the two dimensions of direct planning and implementation of the evaluation process. Furthermore, a fundamental activity often
neglected in program evaluation is the process of preplanning: establish-
ing an appropriate basis on which to determine the need to develop
and implement evaluation.

3. There is a definite lack of emphasis on preplanning an eval-
uation of college advisement. Furthermore, before planning and
implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement, it
is essential to first identify the basic elements of the process of
advisement and, perhaps more important, the need for evaluation.

4. Certain aspects within Stufflebeam's CIPP Model of evalua-
tion, particularly context evaluation, are applicable to preplanning
an evaluation of college advisement. It was further concluded that
Stufflebeam's CIPP Model is also appropriate for planning and imple-
menting an evaluation of the process of college advisement, as is
Provus' DEM.

Additional conclusions included the following:

5. Based on the necessity for meaningful evaluation of the
advisement process, it was concluded, through this investigation,
that it was, indeed, possible to produce preplanning guidelines for
developing an appropriate information base on which to determine the
need to plan and implement an evaluation of the process of college
advisement.

6. It was concluded that the results obtained from the review
panel for determining the validity of the procedural guidelines did
not indicate uniform agreement among the four judges. However, the
results indicated that the highest percentage of agreement among the
judges on individual standards was reported for Technical Adequacy,
followed by Practicality and Utility, respectively.

7. Based on the percentage of agreement between evaluation experts and advisement experts, it was concluded that the advisement experts considered the guidelines to exhibit more validity than either of the two evaluation experts. However, because of the missing data from three of the four judges, the results were considered to be suspect.

8. Based on the variable results obtained from the expert judges, it was concluded that certain sections of the preplanning procedures may be in need of revision or modification. However, additional validation measures need to be implemented to more clearly specify which components are in need of modification.

Implications, Recommendations, and Guidelines Modifications

The results of this current effort regarding the validity of the guidelines for systematically approaching the preplanning considerations of an evaluation of college advisement suggest several implications, recommendations, and guidelines modifications:

1. Through this investigation, the various components and dimensions of the process of college advisement were identified. These support the potential for further analysis of the advisement process, both from a research as well as an evaluation perspective.

2. Based upon the percentage of nonagreement among the judges on seven questions (2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 15, and 17), it is recognized that the guidelines are not, in totality, appropriate for implementation.
Therefore, an important recommendation would be to modify these same questions before further validation measures are attempted.

3. Based upon the results, it would seem advisable to view the procedure utilized, that of a review panel, as a preliminary step in the validation of the guidelines. Future research, therefore, should entail an initial pilot test of the guidelines followed by a large-scale field test. According to Brickell and Aslanian (1974), pilot tests designate small-scale uses of educational products in natural settings under conditions that approximate normal use, whereas field tests designate broad-scale uses of educational products. In other words, "not until after a product has demonstrated its effectiveness in a small number of settings does it merit broad-scale use" (p. 21).

Brickell and Aslanian (1974) also suggested that:

While small-scale pilot use is an excellent way to get revision leads at low cost and with minimum inconvenience to the schools, large-scale field use is an excellent way to determine in what settings and under what conditions the product will perform as well as or better than it did in the pilot use. (p. 21)

Pilot uses have also been successfully employed with individual components of products during the initial stages of development, before the instructional format "have become crystallized and before effort and money have been poured into making a large volume of the material . . . . Long before a product is ready for field use, its basic features should have been confirmed through pilot use" (Brickell & Aslanian, 1974, p. 21). Thus, it is recommended that, prior to a field test, the guidelines should first be subjected to a pilot test.
4. A major concern with the validation phase of this investigation was the amount of time allotted to the judges for reviewing the guidelines. So as not to create an awesome task for the judges, care was taken to develop the guidelines in as explicit a manner as possible while still retaining the essential information. Both the evaluation experts, however, suggested elaboration of the preplanning steps. Therefore, a recommendation for further research would be to expand the guidelines and include more detailed directions for implementing each of the preplanning steps.

5. Based on the comments from the judges expressing concern over the amount of time required to complete the review process, an additional recommendation would be to conduct the validation stage at some time other than at the end of a semester. Therefore, care should be taken, if this study were to be replicated, to insure sufficient time to allow for the completion of the validation process in order to avoid a conflict with additional sequential responsibilities.

6. It was realized through this investigation the importance of utilizing both advisement and evaluation personnel in the validation of the guidelines. Granted, the two fields are very diverse, but a product which entails preplanning an evaluation of college advisement requires consensus on validity from both areas of expertise. For instance, someone from advisement could conceivably judge the guidelines to be useful and/or practical, whereas an evaluation expert could perceive them as being technically inadequate. Therefore, it is recommended that before the guidelines can be labeled as valid, both advisement and evaluation personnel must be involved in the
validation process.

One of the judges (evaluation expert) suggested that if the advisement experts viewed the guidelines as more valid than the evaluation experts, then this investigator should focus on the results obtained from the advisement experts. Furthermore, modifications or revisions should be based primarily on the comments and recommendations of the advisement experts. The results gathered from the evaluation judges should also be considered to be important, because evaluation personnel will be involved in an evaluation of the college advisement process. However, it is the advisement personnel who will be directly responsible for applying the preplanning guidelines. Therefore, it is implicit, once again, that both advisement and evaluation personnel be involved in the validation process.

7. A secondary purpose of this dissertation was to identify a model or models of evaluation appropriate for evaluating the advisement process. In the Review of the Literature section, Scriven's Pathway Comparison Model was identified as primarily a checklist applicable to the process of meta evaluation. However, it does not appear to be appropriate for planning and implementing an evaluation of the process of college advisement. Therefore, a recommendation for further research would be to utilize the Pathway Comparison Model as a final checklist with which to determine the efficacy of the guidelines.

8. Several models of educational evaluation were examined in the Review of the Literature section to determine their applicability within the context of an evaluation of the process of college
advisement. Based on this review, the CIPP and DEM models of evaluation were considered to be appropriate models for planning and implementing an evaluation of the advisement process. Therefore, an additional recommendation would be that once the preplanning stage of an evaluation has been completed, either the CIPP or DEM models of evaluation be utilized to plan and conduct the evaluation process within the context of college advisement.
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Appendix A

Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design
Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design

Directions: For each question below, circle whether the evaluation design has clearly met the criterion (Yes), has clearly not met the criterion (No), or cannot be clearly determined (?). Circle NA if the criterion does not apply to the evaluation design being reviewed. Use the Elaboration column to provide further explanation for criterion where a No or a ? has been circled.

Title of Evaluation Document: _________________________________________________________________________

Name of Reviewer: _________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Regarding the Adequacy of the Evaluation Conceptualization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Scope: Does the range of information to be provided include all the significant aspects of the program or product being evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is a description of the program or product presented (e.g., philosophy, content, objectives, procedures, setting)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the intended outcomes of the program or product specified, and does the evaluation address them?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are any likely unintended effects from the program or product considered?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Criterion Met</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is cost information about the program or product included?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Relevance: Does the information to be provided adequately serve the evaluation needs of the intended audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the audiences for the evaluation identified?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the objectives of the evaluation explained?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the objectives of the evaluation congruent with the information needs of the intended audiences?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the information to be provided allow necessary decisions about the program or product to be made?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Flexibility: Does the evaluation study allow for new information needs to be met as they arise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Can the design be adapted easily to accommodate new needs?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are known constraints on the evaluation discussed?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Can useful information be obtained in the face of unforeseen constraints, e.g., noncooperation of control groups?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Feasibility:</strong> Can the evaluation be carried out as planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the evaluation resources (time, money, and manpower) adequate to carry out the projected activities?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are management plans specified for conducting evaluation?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has adequate planning been done to support the feasibility of particularly difficult activities?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Criteria Concerning the Adequacy of the Collection and Processing of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Reliability:</strong> Is the information to be collected in a manner such that findings are replicable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are data collection procedures described well enough to be followed by others?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Are scoring or coding procedures objective?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the evaluation instruments reliable?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Objectivity: Have attempts been made to control for bias in data collection and processing?

| 1. Are sources of information clearly specified? | Yes No ? NA | |
| 2. Are possible biases on the part of data collectors adequately controlled? | Yes No ? NA | |

C. Representativeness: Do the information collection and processing procedures ensure that the results accurately portray the program or product?

| 1. Are the data collection instruments valid? | Yes No ? NA | |
| 2. Are the data collection instruments appropriate for the purposes of this evaluation? | Yes No ? NA | |
| 3. Does the evaluation design adequately address the questions it was intended to answer? | Yes No ? NA | |
Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. Criteria Concerning the Adequacy of the Presentation and Reporting of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Timeliness: Is the information provided timely enough to be of use to the audiences for the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the time schedule for reporting meet the needs of the audiences?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the reporting schedule shown to be appropriate for the schedule of decision?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pervasiveness: Is information to be provided to all who need it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is information to be disseminated to all intended audiences?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are attempts being made to make the evaluation information available to relevant audiences beyond those directly affected by the evaluation?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Checklist for Judging the Adequacy of an Evaluation Design—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. General Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ethical Considerations: Does the intended evaluation study strictly follow accepted ethical standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do test administration procedures follow professional standards of ethics?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have protection of human subjects guidelines been followed?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has confidentiality of data been guaranteed?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Protocol: Are appropriate protocol steps planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are appropriate persons contacted in the appropriate sequence?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are department policies and procedures to be followed?</td>
<td>Yes No ? NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Sanders and Nafziger, 1976.
Standards for Judging the Merit of Evaluation Studies¹

Technical Adequacy Standards. Fulfillment of these standards means that an evaluation study reveals and conveys truthful information about the merit of the object of the evaluation. The standards in this category are:

1. Described Situation—the environment in which the evaluation was conducted has been sufficiently identified and described that the environmental influences on the study may be interpreted.

2. Repeatable Situation—the situational conditions under which the study was conducted are sufficiently controllable or available that they can be sufficiently replicated to allow future tests of the stability of the study findings.

3. Authentic Situation—the setting in which the study findings were obtained is sufficiently naturalistic that the findings can be applied in other practical settings.

4. Described Object—the actual object of the evaluation has been sufficiently described that the audiences for the evaluation can determine what variations of the object are covered by the findings.

5. Described Sample—the persons providing the data for the evaluation study have been sufficiently identified and described that the limitations of the study findings that are due to sampling problems may be assessed.

6. Representative Sample—the persons providing the data for the evaluation study are typical of those persons to whom the study findings will be applied.

7. Stable Sample—the periodic attrition and replacement of persons who provided data for the study were sufficiently described and/or controlled that the characteristics of the study sample did not vary from time to time during the study in unknown ways.

¹Stufflebeam, 1978.
8. **Valid Measurement**—what the data gathering instruments and methods, used in the study, actually measure has been sufficiently verified that these instruments and techniques are known to represent and predict findings in accordance with the intentions and conclusions of the study.

9. **Reliable Measurement**—the data gathering instruments and methods, used in the study, give sufficiently similar results on successive trials that the audiences for the study can have confidence in the stability of the results.

10. **Homogeneous Scores**—the part scores that make up the total scores, that are presented in the report, give sufficiently non-contradictory results that the total scores may be considered to be aggregates of mutually reinforcing (internally consistent) part scores.

11. **Appropriate Analysis**—the study's conclusions about attainments, correlations, and cause/effect relationships are backed up by appropriate analyses, i.e., analyses that identify and assess the study's sources of systematic, extraneous, and error variance, and that do not require unwarranted assumptions about the treatments, samples, or measures that were used in the study.

12. **Unequivocal Reporting**—the evaluation report is sufficiently clear in the positions it presents on given issues that different members of the audience would have no doubt about the study's conclusions and recommendations.

13. **Complete Reporting**—the total range of study findings is sufficiently reported that an examination of the study's basic data would reveal no findings that were not included in a technical report from the study.

14. **Objective Evaluators**—the persons who obtained and expressed the study findings were sufficiently independent of what was evaluated or were sufficiently monitored and controlled that the evaluation findings were not distorted by the personal feelings and prejudices of these persons.

**Probity Standards.** Fulfillment of these standards means that the study was conducted in a manner that evidences **uncompromising adherence to the highest principles and ideals of the evaluation profession.** The standards in this category are:
15. Ethical Measurement— the measurement practices used in the study conform to the measurement principles and practices that have been endorsed by professional associations of evaluators (see especially the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests, 1974).

16. Ethical Human Relations— the study's interactions with human subjects conformed to codes of ethical practice that have been endorsed by professional associations of evaluators [see especially the AERA Division H Code of Ethics for Evaluators (48), and the APA Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research with Human Participants (49)].

17. Legal Human Relations— the study's involvement with human subjects— including recruiting, treating, measuring, and reporting— conformed to local, state, and national laws about the use of human subjects.

18. Legal Use of Funds— the study's acquisition, allocation, expenditure, and accounting for the use of resources conformed to local, state, and national laws about the use of public and private funds.

19. Legal Use of Information— the study's acquisition, use, and dissemination of information conformed to local, state, and federal laws about the use of private and public information.

20. Honest Reporting— the study's oral and written reports were free of subterfuge and duplicity and were candid in disclosing the weaknesses of the evaluation study.

21. Human Relations— the study's interactions with human beings evidenced respect for the essential dignity and worth of these persons.

Utility Standards. Fulfillment of these standards means that an evaluation study (produces and disseminates reports that inform practitioners and help them carry out their work). The standards in this category are:

22. Described Audience— the audiences for the evaluation reports and their needs for information from the evaluation were sufficiently assessed throughout the study that the evaluation reports can be judged for their responsiveness to the audiences' interests and needs.
23. **Pertinent Information**—the information contained in the study reports is sufficiently pertinent to the interests and needs of the evaluation's audiences that they would rate the reports as relevant to their work.

24. **Applicable Information**—the information contained in the evaluation reports is so applicable to the situations where the audience's work that they could act on the reported conclusions and recommendations.

25. **Comprehensive Information**—the information contained in the study reports is of sufficient scope that the evaluation's audiences would judge the reports to be adequate in their coverage of most pertinent questions about the object of the evaluation. [Depending on the interests and needs of the audiences, such questions may pertain to context, treatment, alternative treatments, process, outcomes (including side effects), costs, causal inferences, and overall merit.]

26. **Detailed Information**—the extent of detailed presentation for the different parts of the evaluation reports matches the audience's needs for general vs. in-depth information so well that they would judge the study to be effective in meeting their most important information requirements.

27. **Credible Evaluators**—the persons conducting the study are sufficiently trusted by the members of each audience that they would initially suppose the findings to be accurate and free of bias and would assign high ratings to the credence of the study reports.

28. **Balanced Information**—the evaluation reports are sufficiently equitable in their consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation that the audiences would view the evaluation as an impartial appraisal of worth as opposed to a jaundiced attack or a whitewash.

29. **Timely Reporting**—the evaluation reports were released before, or at times when, the audiences needed them.

30. **Pervasive Reporting**—the study findings were disseminated to all members of the audiences.

**Practicality Standards.** Fulfillment of these standards means that the plan for conducting an evaluation is (appropriate for use in
the setting where the evaluation is to be carried out). The standards in this category are:

31. **Operable Design**—the evaluation design is sufficiently feasible that its operating assumptions were met without undue effort or expense.

32. **Diplomatic Evaluators**—the evaluators handled the affairs of the evaluation with sufficient tact that they did not arouse avoidable hostility among those who were involved in the evaluation.

33. **Efficient Operations**—the evaluators were sufficiently efficient and sparing in their use of resources that their work would not be judged as wasteful.

34. **Cost/Effective Results**—the evaluation results were sufficiently valuable that, given a full accounting of the costs involved in getting these results, the audiences would judge the outputs of the evaluation to be equal or greater in value than the value they would assign to the resources that were expended in obtaining these results.
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## Criteria Sheet for Review Panel of Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Adequacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines address the important aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines present any inconsistencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is each preplanning step vital to an evaluation of college advisement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the purpose of the preplanning stage clearly defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the purpose of the guidelines clearly defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this set of guidelines sufficiently complete?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would utilization of the guidelines be <strong>time</strong> efficient?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would utilization of the guidelines be <strong>cost</strong> efficient?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines allow for input from the intended audiences and persons to be involved in the preplanning stage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate decision making prior to the implementation of any evaluation design?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate effective planning before the initiation of an evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate the attainment of consensus from the persons to be involved regarding the goals and programs to accomplish the goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate the development of evaluation techniques and instruments in advance of the implementation of evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate the identification of alternative courses of action regarding programs to attain the goals of college advisement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines provide a mechanism to help determine the credibility of the evaluator(s) and the evaluation information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate the timely reporting of evaluation information to the evaluation audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines facilitate the organization of evaluation resources and activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines allow for the inclusion of unforeseen considerations throughout the pre-planning stage? (Is the structure flexible enough to accommodate unexpected results?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the guidelines provide suggestions for the development of a positive climate for future program evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in pre-planning evaluation of the process of college advisement as a whole?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in pre-planning evaluation of certain specific aspects of the process of college advisement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it feasible to utilize the guidelines in a setting in which college advisement is already established and functioning to determine the need for change within the advisement process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments
Appendix D

Instructions for Review Panel
August 2, 1979

Dear

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the validation phase of my dissertation. I have produced a set of systematic preplanning guidelines for developing an appropriate information base on which to determine the need to plan and implement an evaluation of the process of college advisement.

Enclosed you will find the preplanning guidelines and a criteria sheet with which to determine the adequacy of these guidelines. Explicit directions for completing the task are included.

I would appreciate it if you could complete the task no later than Friday, August 10, 1979. Please contact me as soon as you have completed the task so that I may pick up the materials.

Feel free to ask any questions for clarification. My phone number is: Home (349-8235) or Office (383-1680). Again, thank you for your assistance and cooperation. I will be sharing the results of my dissertation with you upon its completion.

Most sincerely,

Mary-Maureen Hill
Task Directions

1. Included are (1) the Guidelines, which are divided into the following four sections: (a) Procedural Guidelines, (b) the Preplanning Stage, itself, (c) Preplanning Steps, and (d) Preplanning Guides, and (2) a Criteria Sheet which contains the desired standards of technical adequacy, utility, and practicality for the guidelines.

2. Briefly review the Criteria Sheet.

3. Read the material presented in each section of the guidelines carefully. You might want to refer to the Criteria Sheet frequently as you read through each section.

4. Please use your professional judgment to answer each question on the Criteria Sheet by placing an (X) in either the "Yes" column or the "No" column.

5. Use the comment section on the Criteria Sheet for further reactions. You might want to: (a) suggest possible additions or deletions within the preplanning steps, (b) comment on the comprehensiveness of the guidelines, and (c) comment on the clarity of directions for completing the task.

6. Place the Guidelines and the completed Criteria Sheet in the envelope and seal it.

7. Please call to inform me the task is completed.