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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to develop a cognitive organizer of community needs to assist community educators to (a) conceptualize the total potential areas from which needs can arise in their communities, and (b) delineate areas of need for assessment purposes.

Needs assessment was regarded as an integral component of the total process of community education evaluation; a process which, in general terms, constituted the problem addressed in the study. Specifically, the problem identified was the inadequacy of methodology in community education evaluation, rather than failure to accept evaluation per se as an integral component of the total community education process. The cognitive organizer was developed accordingly, as a contribution to community education evaluation methodology at the entry point stage of the needs assessment process.

The Status of Community Education Evaluation

The ready acceptance accorded to evaluation by community educators is amply illustrated by Boyd (1975) when he summarizes the results of a nation-wide survey of current practices in community education evaluation:

Evaluation is a more prominent and wide ranging activity in community education programs than in most other human service areas. (p. 11)

The "human service areas" referred to included recreation programs,
cultural programs, adult education, community mental health centers, and ACTION programs. Bearing in mind the nature of these "human services areas", it is not surprising that evaluation of community education programs can be cast in such a favorable light. Had the comparative data collected in the study been drawn from other "human services areas" such as K-12 programs, special education, and Title I projects, it is distinctly possible to conjecture that the esteemed rating accorded to evaluation of community education in the above quotation would not be possible. Regardless of this conjecture, however, it can be readily concluded from Boyd's study that evaluation currently figures prominently in community education.

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) epitomize the importance of the role they perceive for evaluation in community education when they ask community educators to "acknowledge that the results of . . . evaluation will establish a base for the kind of direction and change that will take place in . . . programs of the future" (p. 251). Seay and Associates (1974) adopt a similar stance in their treatment of accountability and evaluation by claiming that these processes are "part of any responsible management; they are necessary to any responsible decision making" (p. 208).

Santellanes (1975) makes a plea for greater significance to be attributed to evaluation than has been the case in the past because of the "close scrutiny Community Education is experiencing from educators, policy-making and funding groups, as well as citizen groups" (p. 23). This plea is made in the light of the contention that "Community Education's viability for addressing community concerns has gained broader awareness and acceptance" (p. 23). Warden (1973) emphasizes...
the same contention:

Community education . . . has begun to establish
beachheads of a wider, broader development—sometimes
referred to as "community development."

As the scope of Community Education expands to
cومفاف this meaning, so too should the evaluation
procedures adopted by Community Educationists reflect
this change. (p. 1)

The Methodology of Community Education Evaluation

While there is general agreement regarding the importance of
evaluation in the development, implementation, improvement, and on­
going administration of community education programs, it is equally
important to note that consensus exists with respect to the "state of
the art" of evaluation in community education. Boyd (1975) readily
exemplifies the consensus which exists amongst contemporary authors
when he concludes that:

There is heavy reliance on informal methods of
obtaining information as a basis for evaluating
all aspects of local community education
programs: conversations and observations. (p. 7)

Boyd (1975) further emphasizes the inadequacy of the evaluation
methodology employed by community educators:

Community education evaluation methodology is on a
par with evaluation methodology in most other human
services program areas - neither ahead nor behind.
It is the amount rather than the technology of
evaluation that stands out in the field of community
education. (p. 11)

Once again, had comparative data been drawn from "human services program
areas" including K-12 programs, special education and Title I projects,
the "technology" of evaluation in community education could have been
cast in an even less favorable light.
Similarly, Minzey and LeTarte highlight the problem of inadequate evaluation methodology when they contend that "evaluation of more subtle and complicated activities, such as education, . . . [is] possible and desirable and . . . the problem becomes one of technique rather than one of possibility" (p. 242). In concluding their chapter on evaluation, Minzey and LeTarte (1972) refer specifically to community education:

The question then is not should we evaluate Community Education, but how. The answer seems to lie in developing and following a process for evaluation in terms of goals which are measurable rather than following the haphazard, numerical, techniques of the past. (pp. 261-262)

Santellanes (1975) accuses community educators of relying on "tabulations of programs offered and participants enrolled as the basis for determining the success or failure of their efforts" (p. 23). He further contends that there is a "need for evaluation processes and instruments to assess the effectiveness of Community Education efforts, as well as to assist in the decision making process" (p. 23). Warden (1973) joins in denigrating the practice of tabulating programs and participants, finding it to be "a simplistic view of a rather complex developmental process" (p. 1).

The concern shared by contemporary authors in the field of community education for adequate evaluation methodology is, indeed, noteworthy. Concern alone, however, will not alleviate the problem unless it is operationalized through the development, trial and dissemination of methodological procedures. The Director of the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center, Dr. Donald Weaver, expressed this assertion in a recent interview:
Our Center receives more requests for assistance in evaluation related activities than in any other aspect of community education. We have not been able to find resource materials which we can forward in response to these requests. Models for the evaluation of community education do not appear to exist. Practitioners are troubled by this apparent vacuum; they have no entry point nor adequate guidelines with respect to the methodology of evaluation.

Weaver continued by referring to the report of the 1976 external evaluation of the Community Education Development Center at Western Michigan University. The purposes of the center are realized through seven major goals, one of which is to promote research, evaluation, and information dissemination in community education. The External Evaluation Committee (1976) reported that this goal "in comparison with . . . [other] goals listed, fared the poorest and is not being accomplished well" (p. 22).

The present study addresses the problem of inadequate methodology in community education evaluation. A methodology was developed to provide a systematic and sequential approach to the entry point questions which confront community educators at the introductory stage of the evaluation process, that of community needs assessment.

Explanation of Terms Used

For the purpose of this study, the definition of community education which has been adopted is that developed by the Mott Foundation (1977) in formulating their new five year plan:

Community Education is the process which, as related primarily to learning, insures community involvement in identification of community needs, utilization of resources and sharing of power in decision-making, and affects, strengthens and enriches the
quality of living of individuals and their community. (p. 2)

"Community educator" is used to refer to community education staff, including administrative personnel, and advisory council members. Where necessary, differentiation between staff and advisory council members is cited throughout the study.

"Community education program" is used extensively throughout the study. To avoid unnecessary verbiage the term "program", by definition, will subsume "service" and "process." Consequently, the community education program in a given community may include adult basic education, vocational and enrichment classes and the like, provision of transportation for retired or disabled citizens, and ad hoc committees to investigate the plight of an underprivileged community group. The definition, thus expanded, is meant to subsume both sides of the program versus process schism which has developed amongst community educators.

"Evaluation" has been defined in specific terms by theorists and practitioners according to the use of the process contextually. In general terms, however, consensus exists with respect to the following dictionary-like definition cited by Stufflebeam (1975);

Evaluation is the act of examining and judging, concerning the worth, quality, significance, amount, degree, or condition of something. (p. 8)

For the purpose of the study this general definition was adopted in the reworded form; evaluation is the process of systematically determining the merit or worth of something.

Inasmuch as the definition of community education cited above refers specifically to "identification of community needs" and
"sharing of power in decision-making", a more specific definition of evaluation, one which related the process to decision making, was found to be necessary. Consequently, Stufflebeam's 1971 definition, "Educational evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (p. 40), was adopted.

The oft-occurring terms "need" and "needs assessment" are not to be explained simply. This issue is taken up again in Chapter III when related literature is discussed. The definitions used in this study are those proposed by Stufflebeam (1977), who contends that a need is "something that can be shown to be necessary or useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose" (p. 23), and that needs assessment is "the process of determining what things are needed to serve some worthy purpose" (p. 26). Stufflebeam (1977) expands these definitions to provide specificity, and needs assessment is operationalized (pp. 27-31) in the form of a checklist for designing needs assessments. The checklist is illustrative of the methodological aids which can be adopted or adapted for use in community education evaluation.

The "cognitive organizer" can best be defined as an entry point methodology to enable community educators to conceptualize the total potential areas from which needs can arise in their communities, and to delineate areas of need for assessment purposes. During the study, community educators at Lakewood, Michigan were trained in evaluation theory and in the use of the cognitive organizer. In a quest for simplified terminology the cognitive organizer was referred to as a "pre-needs assessment strategy", or where relevant, as the "Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix." These descriptors can be found in
Appendices A, B and C, outlines of the training seminars. (The reader should note that Appendices A, B and C each have appendices attached to them. To avoid confusion in the text of the study, consecutive arabic numerals will be used to denote appendices within Appendices.)

Summary

In this chapter it was established that although evaluation is widely accepted in community education, the process is practiced informally through such methods as tabulations of programs and participants. The problem delineated for the study, therefore, was the inadequacy of evaluation methodology in community education.

Because of the broad scope of this problem, the study's response was limited to methodological development and implementation at the introductory stage of the evaluation process, that of community needs assessment. A methodology was developed to provide a systematic and sequential approach to the entry point questions which confront community educators in conducting community needs assessments. Specifically, a cognitive organizer of community needs was developed to enable community educators to conceptualize total community needs, and delineate needs for assessment purposes. The cognitive organizer was implemented under independent observation with a view to recommending improvements in its structure and utility. This broad goal statement is expanded into specific objectives in Chapter II following an explanation of the limitations imposed on the study.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

The problem delineated in this study was the inadequacy of evaluation methodology in community education. In Chapter I it was established that community educators readily accept evaluation as part of the community education process, and that evaluation is widely conducted by community educators at present. Additionally, it was established that methodological development in community education evaluation has not paralleled the rapid acceptance and incidence of evaluation in community education.

Chapter II opens with a collation of the antecedent factors that have operated against methodological development in community education evaluation. The study's response to the problem despite these inhibiting factors, and the limitations imposed on the response to the problem are expounded. The chapter concludes with a statement of the objectives developed for the study.

Antecedent Factors Pertaining to the Problem

While contemporary authors generally agree that the methodology of community education evaluation is inadequate, very few have attempted explanations for this state of affairs. A notable exception is Stufflebeam (1975), who argues that "traditionally, Community Educators have not been trained to do evaluation" (p. 7), and that "only recently have the public and funding agencies begun to demand that"
Community Educators provide accountability reports that are based on formal evaluation work" (p. 7). The same author claims that "theoretical frameworks for evaluation are just now being applied to the concept of Community Education" (p. 7), and that "as Community Education continues to gain prominence in the amount of public attention and funds it receives, it seems likely that Community Educators will increase their collaboration with professional evaluators" (p. 7).

Santellanes (1975) cites the symptoms of an evaluation illness described by Stufflebeam (1971):

1. AVOIDANCE SYMPTOM: Because evaluation seems to be a painful process, everyone avoids it unless absolutely necessary.
2. ANXIETY SYMPTOM: Anxiety stems primarily from the ambiguities of the evaluation process.
3. IMMOBILIZATION SYMPTOM: Despite the opportunity that has existed for four or more decades, schools have not responded to evaluation in any meaningful way.
4. SKEPTICISM SYMPTOM: Despite the evident need for evaluation and despite the theoretically desirable consequences that accrue from having done it, many persons seem to argue "it can't be done anyway."
5. LACK OF GUIDELINES SYMPTOM: The notable lack of meaningful and operational guidelines.
6. MISADVICE SYMPTOM: Evaluation consultants continue to give bad advice to practitioners.
7. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE SYMPTOM: Another difficulty with evaluation is that it is so often incapable of uncovering any significant information.
8. MISSING ELEMENTS SYMPTOM: A lack of the following elements: adequate theory, specification of the kind of evaluative information which would be most useful, appropriate instruments and designs, mechanisms for organizing, processing and reporting evaluative information, and trained personnel.
(p. 20)

Of these, the "lack of guidelines" and the "missing elements" symptoms are particularly relevant to a discussion of the causal factors underlying the inadequacy of community education evaluation
methodology.

Mention was made in Chapter I of the Warden (1973) and Santellanes (1975) claims that community educators have relied too heavily on the tabulations of programs and participants for evaluation purposes. For this situation to develop, funding agencies and education offices at the local, state, and federal levels must, in turn, have accepted this practice as an adequate form of evaluation. Under these circumstances it is not difficult to conceive of a stagnation in the development of sound, relevant, and adequate community education evaluation methodologies.

An attempt to summarize the antecedent factors pertaining to the problem of inadequate community education evaluation methodology follows. Many of these are drawn from the contemporary authors mentioned above, while others are conjecture on the part of the present writer in an attempt to complete the picture. Accordingly, antecedent factors pertaining to the problem include at least the following:

1. Community education pre-service and in-service training has not traditionally incorporated courses in evaluation.
2. Community education staff, therefore, are not cognizant of the established evaluation methodologies of other fields.
3. Very few attempts have been made to involve advisory council members or citizens in general in the evaluation of community education. Consequently, methodologies reflecting community involvement which should have emanated,
have not been developed.

4. Until recently, funding agencies and local, state and federal education offices have not provided guidelines adequate enough to insure formality in community education evaluation.

5. Informal methods of evaluation, therefore, have prevailed. The practice of tabulating programs and participants is illustrative of the methods which have been undertaken and accepted.

6. The established theoretical frameworks for educational evaluation have not, until recently, been applied to community education. Santellanes (1975) is a notable exception through his work with the Stufflebeam Content, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model.

7. Community educators in general have not made budgetary allocations for evaluation purposes.

8. There exists a dire shortage of consultative personnel trained and experienced in community education evaluation.

9. Community educators have perceived evaluation to be a complex process.

10. By comparison with K-12 education, community education is relatively all encompassing in its scope. As a consequence, the complexity which is construed by many to be inherent in the process of evaluation has been magnified accordingly.

11. Community education programs which have been developed to reflect community needs will necessarily differ substantially from one community to another. The development of pervasive
community education evaluation models has been hampered by this diversity.

12. Assumptions which can generally be made for evaluation of K-12 program components such as the elementary science curriculum, cannot, as a rule, be made for evaluation of community education. These assumptions include the availability of funds and trained personnel, and a relatively limited scope for the evaluation.

13. Community educators have been troubled by their inability to determine an entry point into formal evaluation. Weaver's earlier comment is particularly relevant in this regard. As has been pointed out, informal evaluation methodologies have been utilized. This has been detrimental to methodological development at the entry point stage of evaluating community education programs.

**Justification of the Study's Response to the Problem**

**Accountability**

Despite the inhibiting nature of the antecedent factors which have operated against the development of community education evaluation methodology, community educators are being required increasingly to formalize their evaluation procedures. Santellanes (1975) refers to the "recent passage of supportive federal legislation [which] has . . . given Community Education further public exposure and has essentially placed it in a 'fish bowl' for public view" (p. 23). It is reasonable to expect that public scrutiny of community education will increase
correspondingly with the influx of public funding. To remain accountable in the light of this increased scrutiny, community educators will be forced to dispense with sole reliance on such methodologies as tabulations of programs and participants, and to diversify and formalize their evaluation work accordingly.

Stufflebeam (1975) argues cogently that the two main uses of evaluation are providing information for decision making and accountability. The first of these two roles he purports, "calls for a proactive application of evaluation, as information is provided to decision-makers in advance of when they must make decisions" (p. 8). In a sense, this type of evaluation can be likened to formative evaluation as defined by Scriven (1967). Related to community education, this type of evaluation is relevant during needs assessments and program development, implementation, and improvement.

The second role of evaluation, providing information for accountability, is, in Stufflebeam (1975) terminology, "a retroactive application of evaluation that provides information after efforts have been completed" (p. 8). Evaluation to provide information for accountability purposes can be likened to what Scriven (1967) has termed summative evaluation. Related to community education, this type of evaluation is applicable in determining the merit or worth of the program as a finished project. It should be noted, however, that the two types of evaluation thus determined, are not mutually exclusive. Summative evaluation for accountability purposes should follow properly conducted formative evaluation during program development, implementation, and improvement.

It has been pointed out that accountability is an issue which
community educators must address increasingly with burgeoning public scrutiny of their programs. The importance of formally conducted summative evaluation in this regard is self-evident. While not so readily apparent, it is equally important for community educators to formalize formative evaluation work. This can be achieved in two main ways; by developing frameworks and methodologies for community education evaluation, or by adopting or adapting the established evaluation frameworks and methodologies of other fields. The latter course of action was chosen in this study; Stufflebeam's CIPP model for evaluation and his Working Paper on Needs Assessment in Evaluation have been adapted to the special circumstances which apply in community education.

**Evaluation and the transition from program to process orientation in community education**

Program versus process orientation is a much discussed dichotomy in community education. Minzey and LeTarte (1972) address the role of evaluation in program oriented community education when they claim that:

> While Community Education is really comprised of program and process, many Community Education endeavors have stopped short of total development and consequently are highly program oriented. With only this much development, a statistical data gathering technique is often sufficient. Where the primary concern is with numbers of people and programs, the data collected generally will be adequate if it accurately determines numbers of people involved. (p. 249)

In the elevated role which Minzey and LeTarte (1972) propose for evaluation, they ask community educators to "acknowledge that the results of . . . evaluation will establish a base for the kind of
direction and change that will take place in . . . programs of the future" (p. 251).

Santellanes (1975) directs attention to the need for process evaluation in community education:

If community educators sincerely believe in a process orientation, this philosophy must be incorporated into the evaluation process. Tabulations of programs offered and participants enrolled should no longer provide the sole basis for assessing the success or failure of Community Education. The manner in which community educators work with and involve people should not only be emphasized but also evaluated. Consistent with this philosophy, community educators must concentrate on the process used in an evaluation, as well as the results of such an endeavor. (p. 23)

Santellanes in this instance, is referring to input and process evaluation as subsumed by the CIPP model. A relationship between evaluation and the transition from program to process orientation in community education is not inferred. Minzey and LeTarte, however, infer a more direct relationship between evaluation and the transition from program to process orientation in community education. This relationship is discussed at length in Appendix B when the cognitive organizer is proposed. Suffice it to say for the present, that a properly conducted needs assessment, which to all intents and purposes is a context type of evaluation, provides information that is potentially incremental in the transition from program to process orientation in community education.

Quite apart from the benefits to be gained in community education through evaluation to provide information for accountability purposes, and the incremental value of evaluation in the transition from program to process orientation, there are three further factors which justify the
response to the problem delineated in this study. These factors have been set apart purposely, because the cognitive organizer developed in the study constitutes an attempt to respond to them specifically.

Advisory council involvement

The first of these factors is depicted in the literature by a variety of descriptors including "community involvement", "citizen participation", "shared decision making" and the like. Community education advisory councils may be construed similarly to be an attempt to involve members of the community in the development, improvement, maintenance, and evaluation of community education programs. The phraseology "may be construed" has been used with intent inasmuch as too many advisory councils are treated by practitioners as "rubber stamping" groups for them to be otherwise described.

It cannot be assumed automatically that advisory council input will necessarily result in better decisions being made. Alexander (1976) points out that mobilizing people is but one of the components necessary to improve decision making with respect to goal setting. They must be made cognizant of the realities of negotiation and compromise. Alexander argues that without such education, goals are set without due consideration, participants become preoccupied with means to achieve goals rather than the goals themselves, and that there is an increase in the temptation to produce quick results even if they are not related to goals.

The cognitive organizer developed in the study responds to these
preoccupations. As a methodology, it suggests a systematic approach to the initial stages of the needs assessment process, a process which, by definition, is closely linked to goal setting. The methodology provides a framework for decision making in which sequence is encompassed. Direction thus determined, the decision making process to be adopted can be delineated and learned.

In this regard Bryant and White (1975) maintain that the oft-used process of consensus is a matter which bears investigation. They emphasize the necessity to recognize and thus legitimize differences. Consensus cannot, they contend, be forced nor ignored. Inexperienced citizen groups may fail to recognize conflicts, resulting in goal displacement and unproductive frustration. Skilled leadership, they conclude, is necessary to manage conflict in the decision making process so that inexperienced participants can confront each other without losing sight of the original goal.

Consensus was the decision making strategy recommended in utilizing the cognitive organizer. Advisory council input was assumed; the implementation of the cognitive organizer is, in fact, contingent upon such participation. It should not be assumed, however, that advisory council involvement ceases at the completion of the community needs assessment. Context evaluation is but one component of the CIPP model, and involvement should continue throughout the entire process.

The entry point dilemma

The second factor to which the cognitive organizer is an intended
response is the entry point dilemma outlined by Weaver (p. 5). When a community needs assessment is advocated, one of the first questions generally asked is "What needs?" The question is legitimate. It directs attention to a number of crucial and difficult entry point questions that must be answered at the initial stages of the needs assessment.

What is the purpose of the needs assessment? What are the information needs of the audience(s)? What group(s) of people will constitute the community in the needs assessment? Are the needs to be assessed primarily vocational, social, intellectual, or others? What is the possible range of needs that could be assessed? Will the needs of the whole community be assessed or will specific groups of the community be singled out?

A review of the literature in community education did not reveal methodological developments which could be adapted or adopted by community educators to systematically answer these questions, a factor which may largely account for the high incidence of informality in current community education needs assessment practice. The cognitive organizer was developed as an application of Stufflebeam's (1977) Working Paper on Needs Assessment Evaluation. It is a methodological development proposed for use in community education needs assessment to systematize the approach to entry point questions.

Availability of resources

It has been demonstrated that community education evaluation methodological development has suffered because budgetary allocations have not traditionally been set aside for evaluation purposes, and
because there exists a severe lack of personnel trained and experienced in community education evaluation. The answer to the first of these problems seems, at first glance, to be relatively simple—community educators should make the necessary budgetary allocations. A more thorough investigation of the problem, however, reveals an additional problem which has been the center of controversy in evaluation theory for decades. In essence, this problem as it relates to community education, is whether evaluation should be conducted by personnel internally involved with the program or by independent external evaluation experts.

Scriven (1977) argues cogently that because of overhead expenses, independent, full-time evaluators must charge $200 per day to break even. Very few community education budgets could stand the $350 per day consultation fees which Scriven suggests accordingly as a minimum. In the case of school based programs, evaluation experts may be available at the district level. Stufflebeam (1975) maintains that such personnel can be considered to be external to the program. Where district level evaluators are not available, or in the case of non-school based programs, community educators must decide whether to increase their budget allocation to pay for external evaluation of their programs, or to undertake the evaluation of their programs themselves.

Stufflebeam (1975) recommends that "evaluation be performed by both internal and external agents" (p. 11). In his view, "an in-house evaluation group should perform the formative proactive evaluation needed to service decision making" (p. 11) and "retroactive, summative evaluation should generally be conducted by an external agent" (p. 11).
To perform formative evaluation work the "in-house evaluation groups" Stufflebeam refers to must be familiar with evaluation theory, and they must have an array of methodological aids at their disposal. The cognitive organizer was developed in response to the need for evaluation methodologies which facilitate community educator involvement in program evaluation, that is, to provide a useable tool for use by "in-house evaluation groups."

Limitations of the Study

It was not the intent of this study to develop a model for the evaluation of community education programs, nor is such an endeavor advocated. A more attractive alternative is available: applying the established evaluation models of related educational fields through adapting or adopting them to community education evaluation. Moreover, model development is far beyond the scope of the study. Accordingly, the study was limited to one aspect of the evaluation process, that of needs assessment. It has already been intimated that needs assessment can be likened to context evaluation as subsumed in Stufflebeam's CIPP model.

Just as evaluation can be construed to be a complex process, so too can needs assessment. It was further proposed, therefore, to limit the study to methodological development pertaining to the preparatory stages of the needs assessment process.

The intended audiences for the study were field based community education staff and advisory council members. The study was limited accordingly, to methodological development and implementation at the
program level, sometimes referred to as the "building level." This limitation was not meant to imply that the study was restricted to school based community education programs; the claim is made that the methodology developed in the study is generalizable to non-school based community education programs.

Although the limitations proposed for the study precluded an operationalized needs assessment, it was necessary to trial the pre-needs assessment methodology developed in a practical situation, with a view to delineating its shortcomings, and making recommendations for improvements accordingly. To implement the methodology it was obviously necessary that needs assessment had to be placed contextually in the total evaluation process. Consequently, the training sessions designed to introduce and implement the methodology incorporated a theoretical treatment of the total evaluation process and a suggested plan for conducting a community needs assessment (Appendix A).

Objectives of the Study

Bearing in mind the limitations imposed, the objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To develop a cognitive organizer of community needs as a methodology to enable community educators to (a) conceptualize the total potential areas from which needs can arise in their communities, and (b) delineate areas of need for assessment purposes.

2. To train community educators at Lakewood, Michigan in evaluation theory and in the use of the cognitive organizer.

3. To implement the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan
under independent observation with a view to suggesting improvements in its structure and utility.

Summary

In this chapter the problem was reviewed and the antecedent factors which have contributed to it were outlined. Justification of the study's response to the problem was then undertaken and, limitations imposed were expounded. The chapter concluded with a concise statement of the objectives for the study.

Chapter III reports the needs assessment literature reviewed and the contextual placement, development, rationale, and implementation of the cognitive organizer.
CHAPTER III

RATIONALE FOR AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE COGNITIVE ORGANIZER

The problem delineated in the study was the inadequacy of evaluation methodology in community education. The response to the problem was limited as outlined in Chapter II, to methodological development and implementation at the entry point of the total evaluation process, that of community needs assessment.

The major purposes of this chapter are to (1) review literature related to needs assessment in community education and other educational fields, (2) explicate the placement of needs assessment contextually in the total evaluation process, (3) document the development of the cognitive organizer, (4) present a rationale for the cognitive organizer, (5) delineate the steps necessary to implement the cognitive organizer, (6) outline a case for the cognitive organizer as a facilitating factor in the transition from program to process orientation in community education, and (7) describe the procedures adopted to monitor the presentation and implementation of the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan.

The reader should note that apart from (1) the literature review and (2) the procedures adopted to monitor the implementation of the cognitive organizer, these purposes are addressed in Appendices A, B, and C, the training packages developed to present and implement the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan. Appendix A, the Training Package.
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The Review of Needs Assessment Literature

Initially, a review of needs assessment literature in community education was conducted. It became apparent, however, that the review had to be expanded to related fields. The needs assessment literature in community education was replete with declarations regarding the importance of the process, but very few writers in this field attempted to do more than encourage practitioners to utilize the process. The trend thus discerned in community education needs assessment literature was not considered to be surprising. In general, contemporary community education writers have not addressed the evaluation process in depth, and needs assessment is an integral component of the total evaluation process.

The claim that needs assessment is an integral component of the total evaluation process is substantiated by Scriven (1967) whose Pathway
Comparison Model for evaluation subsumes the process as one of the last steps in the model. Similarly, Alkin (1969) refers to the process as "systems assessment" and incorporates it as the first stage of his Center for Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles (CSE) Model, and Stufflebeam's (1971) Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Model includes the process as a central component of context evaluation. In the light of this evidence it is not difficult to explain the general treatment accorded to the needs assessment process by contemporary community education authors. The evaluation process in total has been addressed in general terms, and needs assessment, as an integral component of the process, has been similarly treated.

The review is presented in three sections. First, the needs assessment literature in community education is reported and critiqued from a methodological viewpoint. Second the literature pertaining to the problem of defining the term "need" is reported. Third, literature relating to the recent development of the concept of primary and secondary needs is presented and discussed in reference to community education.

Needs assessment literature in community education

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) address the needs assessment process in general terms. They do, however, introduce an element of controversy by claiming that introductory programs should be operating and school buildings should be open to "create a public image and deal with the most obvious community needs" (p. 59) before a formal needs assessment is conducted. The claim is made that the transition from program to process orientation can be accomplished by input from all segments of the community after a basic program has been established.
Recent developments with respect to non-school based models of community education would seem to belie the Minzey and LeTarte assertion that buildings should be open before implementing a formal needs assessment. Moreover, it cannot be assumed that programs developed informally will necessarily "deal with the most obvious community needs."

Irrespective of conjecture about the timing of formal needs assessment in community education, Minzey and LeTarte disregard the methodology of the process. Their treatment of the topic is a very general discussion of community surveys and door-to-door interviews.

Warden (1973) poses a series of 125 questions in 14 broad areas which, he argues, should concern community educators in self-evaluating their programs. Of the broad areas listed, category XII Developing Programs Based Upon Needs, includes the following relevant questions:

- Have the programs developed in the past truly reflected the needs of the community? How do you know?
- What factions, if any, appear at present not to be served? Why?
- What evaluation procedures have been established or developed to measure if the Community Education program is reflecting community needs?
- How are present program priorities established?
- To what extent is community involvement a part of the program development? Who determines how extensive this involvement will be? Why? (p. 9)

These questions are good examples of the type of entry point considerations community educators should address when planning to conduct community needs assessments. Warden, however, does not develop them into a strategy which could be adopted universally in community education.

Allan (1974) attacks current practices in community education needs assessment claiming that because the community is not involved in planning and questionnaire development, questionable data result. He notes that as a result of these shortcomings "programs are implemented that often
service only a small percentage of the community" (p. 2). Allan claims that his community needs assessment model "presents six on-going strategies for assessing community needs in order to activate the Community Education process" (p. 3). Of these, involving the community in decision making is presented as a third priority strategy. While it is agreed that shared decision making is desirable, the priority accorded can be challenged. The decision to conduct a community needs assessment is one which should be shared, and as a consequence, this strategy should probably have first priority.

Helpful suggestions are made to implement the model, but it is not presented in operational form as a methodology which could be adopted by community educators. Additionally, the model assumes incorrectly that synonymity exists between needs assessment in operational form and community needs questionnaires. Other methods such as the delphi technique and personal interviews can be utilized to equal advantage.

Seay (1975) maintains that needs assessment is encompassed in the evaluation of the setting. This type of evaluation, he contends, "seeks information about such basic matters as individual needs, problem areas, relevant attitudes, potential problem-solving resources, and human and organizational relationships" (p. 221).

The inclusion of "potential problem solving resources" in the needs assessment process is questionable. Needs alone should be assessed in the needs assessment process, otherwise the process should be entitled "needs and resources assessment", and in the latter type of assessment the tendency exists for needs to be "found" to match resources identified in the process. Community education programs which are developed in response to available resources can hardly be construed to be process or
Community development oriented.

Seay's treatment of needs assessment methodology is very general and survey methods are dwelled upon heavily in a manner similar to that presented by Allan (1974).

Radig (1974) presents a convincing rationale for needs assessment as a vital part of the community education process. He differs from Stufflebeam's (1977) contention that needs assessment is a difficult and complex area, claiming it to be "a process that is not very complicated" (p. 5). This claim is made with respect to informal needs assessments—the type of assessing that most people do when making decisions on a day-to-day basis. Radig views this type of assessment to be part of the community education coordinator's role, a role which involves the coordinator primarily in decision making with respect to information informally obtained. The author notes that the coordinator's decision making role in formal needs assessment is relatively limited.

The coordinator is mainly responsible to facilitate and foster an organized process of group involvement in painting an accurate picture of where the community is, where it wants to go, and the gaps or needs to be filled to achieve a better community. (p. 11)

Radig suggests a needs assessment of five specific steps:

1. A self-study which determines the actual conditions in the community, sometimes called a context evaluation.
2. Identifying its [the community's] expectations or its goals.
3. Analyzing the discrepancies between these conditions.
4. Need description, making decisions as to what the gaps or needs are and describing them.
5. Prioritizing these needs in their most important order. (p. 11)

Community involvement is emphasized during the brief explication of each of these steps. It is in one of these explanations, however,
that the suggested process fails to provide methodological direction. Radig notes that "community education is such an all encompassing concept that problems often occur when trying to break it down into tangible subject areas for investigation" (p. 12). In response to this problem the author contends that "the coordinator and the steering committee members [an ad hoc sub-group of the advisory council] should choose the most appropriate topical areas for study in their community" (p. 13).

Minzey's (1974) description of the community education concept in terms of K-12 programs, enrichment programs for children and youth, use of community facilities, programs for adults, the coordination and delivery of social services, and community involvement in decision making is suggested as a starting point to delineate "the most appropriate topical areas."

As an entry point strategy this step could misdirect the entire needs assessment process. It would be more appropriate to break community needs down to facilitate delineation of needs to be assessed, rather than breaking the community education concept down for this purpose. If, as Radig claims, community education is an all encompassing concept, program development should be possible irrespective of the needs delineated.

Tucker (1974) contends that "the assessment of community needs is difficult if not impossible to totally derive" (p. i). The contention has credibility because it would be impossible to assess all the different types of needs of all the individuals and groups in the community. Tucker maintains, therefore, that:

\[\text{It has been the general consensus of the majority of planners over the centuries to let the community evolve at its own rate of speed, with whatever}\]
Imbalances [that] develop among the demographic characteristics of the population, depleting whatever resources are available by anyone who has the whim and support to do so, letting shortages and gaps lay dormant or expand among all community systems, and creating systems for an elitist group without real observation of the distribution of needs for the total community. (p. i)

The author argues further that when worthwhile community needs assessment techniques have been developed, they are too often "shelved or used as case studies among the academicians and lofty idealists" (p. i) instead of being practically applied. This argument may account in part for the lack of methodological development in community education needs assessment. Regardless of this conjecture, the need for an assessment technique which enables community educators to conceptualize the total potential areas of need in their community is evident.

In A Guide to Needs Assessment in Community Education, funded by the United States Office of Education under the Community Schools Act, Bowers (1977) advises that applications for a federal community education program grant must include the following:

1. Each proposed Community Education Program must provide an analysis and documentation of the educational, cultural, recreational, health, and related needs, interests, and concerns of the community to be served.
2. The application must include a prioritization of the community's needs, and must indicate which needs the program expects to serve.
3. Applications which do not propose services in each of the areas of educational, recreational, health, and cultural activities, must provide documentation that community needs were examined in each area in which services are not proposed and must give the basis for not proposing the services.
4. All applications should provide a plan for the involvement of community colleges, social, recreational, health, and other community groups, and persons broadly representative of the area or areas to be served by the project as advisors.
in the preparation of the application.

5. All applications must also provide for community participation and for the involvement of other agencies and organizations, public and private, in all aspects of the program, including needs assessment. (pp. 2-3)

In response to these mandates Bowers presents a nine step methodology for community education needs assessment. The methodology represents the only comprehensive model for the process discerned in the review of needs assessment literature in community education. The steps outlined in the model are as follows:

Step 1. Identifying People and Roles
Step 2. Speaking the Same Language
Step 3. Stating Concerns and Goals
Step 4. Finding the Needs
Step 5. Measuring and Ranking the Needs
Step 6. Setting Priorities
Step 7. Determining the Feasibility of Meeting the Needs
Step 8. Planning the Program (Objectives and Procedures)
Step 9. Continuous Reassessment (p. 7)

The concept of "areas of concern", defined as "matters for consideration which demand a greater amount of analysis than does a specific problem" (p. 13), is introduced. These are generated by the needs assessment committee, a group of agency representatives and citizens. Agency program information is then collected to determine whether discrepancies exist between existing programs and community needs. The method suggested for generating "areas of concern"—testimony by needs assessment committee members—leaves much to be desired. No thought is given to the possible range of needs which exist in individuals and in the community at large. Thus, the composition of the committee and the personal values of the members are primary influences in delineating the needs to be assessed.

The eighth step in the Bowers' methodology, planning the program,
is outside the realm of the needs assessment process. This is "program planning evaluation" as incorporated in the Alkin (1969) CSE model or "input evaluation" as subsumed by the Stufflebeam (1971) CIPP model. Although the placement of the step is contextually in accord with these evaluation models its inclusion in the needs assessment process could cause confusion. Community educators as a result, may perceive needs assessment to be separate from the evaluation process rather than an entry point into the process.

Definition of need

The problem of defining the term "need" is crucial to the needs assessment process. As a result of a comprehensive review of needs assessment literature Stufflebeam (1977) identified four definitions of need that are frequently used.

The first of these is the discrepancy definition of need as "the gap between desired performance and observed or predicted performance" (p. 5). This definition is widely used in community education. Discrepancies are sought, for example, between present and optimum human service agency program offerings in the community. The problem which exists when using this definition is that "optimum program offerings" are difficult to determine.

The second definition of need Stufflebeam identified is the democratic viewpoint. Thus defined, a need is regarded as "a change desired by the majority of some reference groups" (p. 19). This definition is often used in community education too, mainly because it is easy to apply in assessments, and it has high public relations value. The problem which exists when using this definition in community education
is that needs are confused with preferences, and preferences imply a pre-established list of alternatives to select from. It can readily be contended that program orientation in community education results from assessments conducted using this definition of need.

The third definition Stufflebeam identifies is the diagnostic view proposed by Scriven (1977). In summarizing the Scriven definition Stufflebeam contends that from a diagnostic viewpoint "need is something whose absence or deficiency proves harmful" (p. 6). The main strength of the definition is also its weakness. It highlights the lower order or survival needs suggested in Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of human needs. If applied to community education this definition would rule out many existing programs, particularly those of an enrichment or recreational nature.

The fourth definition outlined by Stufflebeam is the analytic view that a need is "a direction in which improvement would occur given information about the status of a person or program" (p. 7). Although potentially advantageous to community education, this definition is not widely used.

Stufflebeam (1977), in attempting to incorporate the advantages and avoid the disadvantages of the four definitions identified, proposes the following:

A need is something that can be shown to be necessary or useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose.
A defensible purpose is one that meets certain ethical and utility criteria or at least is not counterproductive in relation to these criteria.
A necessary thing is one that is required to achieve a particular purpose.
Something that is useful helps but may not be essential in fulfilling a purpose. (p. 22)
This definition was adopted for use in developing the cognitive organizer in the present study. The concept of "defensible purposes" is one which can be applied directly to program development in community education. If a given program directly reflects or services community needs the "defensible purposes" of the program will be readily apparent.

**Primary and secondary needs**

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) and Seay (1974) argue cogently that programs should be developed in community education which reflect community needs. Practitioners who disregard community needs when developing programs are probably the group to which the much used descriptor "program oriented" applies. Community educators, however, can be confronted with a dilemma in this regard. Extant community needs, for example, might be of such a nature that relevant and meritorious program responses could cause prohibiting budgetary problems. As a consequence, programs may have to be developed in other areas to provide the funds necessary to facilitate program development in response to community needs such as those mentioned above.

Stufflebeam (1977) clarifies this dilemma to some extent by introducing the concept of primary and secondary needs. Primary needs, he contends, are those which derive from the purpose of schooling—to promote human growth and development. Such growth and development, he concludes, takes place in human beings intellectually, emotionally, physically, morally, aesthetically, vocationally, and socially. The primary need areas thus categorized are presented in detail in Appendix B4, page 131. Secondary needs according to Stufflebeam, are those "which are derived from and contribute to fulfilling the primary needs" (p. 14).
The dilemma confronting the community educator as outlined above can be readily explained in terms of primary and secondary needs. The secondary need of available funding must be met to facilitate the development of program responses to primary needs. This does not infer that community educators should abdicate responsibility for program development reflecting community needs in some cases merely to facilitate program development in response to community needs in other areas. Indeed, community educators should be readily able to state defensible purposes in addition to "raising funds" for all programs developed.

The primary need areas outlined by Stufflebeam sparked the development of the cognitive organizer in the present study. To be able to conceptualize the total potential areas of need in a community, some form of categorization was required. The manner in which the primary need areas were adopted is presented in Appendix B, page 116.

The reader should note once again that purposes (2) through (6) delineated for this chapter are addressed sequentially in Appendices A, B, and C. The response to purpose (7), a description of the procedures adopted to monitor the presentation and implementation of the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan, follows.

Procedures Followed to Monitor the Introduction and Implementation of the Cognitive Organizer

Introduction

On November 16, 1977 the Director of Lakewood Community Education, Mr. Daryl Hartzler, sought assistance from the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center (WMUCEDC) with an
evaluation of the Lakewood Community Education program. The WMUCEDC submitted a proposal to evaluate the Lakewood Community Education program with the Assistant Director of the Center, Dr. Peter Prout as consultant, and the present writer as community needs assessment advisor. The proposal was accepted by the Lakewood Community Education Advisory Council (LCEAC) on November 29, 1977. The cognitive organizer was presented and implemented accordingly at special meetings of the LCEAC on January 10 and January 24, 1978.

The cognitive organizer was presented and implemented per the medium of three training packages (Appendices A, B, and C). Following each presentation feedback was obtained from three sources. First, participant feedback instruments (Appendices D, E, and F) were administered after each training package was presented. Second, an independent observer was engaged to provide additional feedback and to monitor instrument administration. Third, the presentations and the task group and total seminar decision making sessions which ensued were tape recorded. Reviews of these tape recordings were used in conjunction with the present writer's own observations as a basis for the reports and recommendations which appear in Chapter IV.

Instrumentation

An early undertaking was the development of the training packages and the participant feedback instruments. These were submitted to three professors specializing in measurement and evaluation, and three experienced community educators to ascertain instrument face validity. As a result of comments from these professional educators four items were added to the instruments. Those requested to perform this task also gave comments
about the appropriateness of wording and arrangement of items. Three items were reworded to provide acceptable clarity as a result of the suggestions made.

Certification of measures adopted to protect respondents' confidentiality was lodged with the Department of Educational Leadership, Western Michigan University, in response to that department's request for assurance of confidentiality and protection when human subjects are implicated in research.

The training packages were presented at two seminars to which Lakewood Community Education staff and advisory council members were invited by the Director and the LCEAC President, Mrs. A. Grinage. Those who attended the seminars—16 on January 10, and 15 on January 24—constituted the population and the sample for instrument administration.

Responses were sought by means of a Likert scale to three categories of items: (1) the effectiveness of training materials; (2) participant gains in knowledge of evaluation, needs assessment, and the cognitive organizer; and, (3) participant perceptions of the degree of difficulty experienced in implementing each step of the cognitive organizer. Bearing in mind the small population and sample size, means of Likert scale responses were computed and, in the case of paired instrument items, compared.

Open ended responses were sought to two categories of items: (1) those pertaining to each seminar overall; and, (2) those requesting additional information regarding difficulty experienced by participants in implementing each step of the cognitive organizer. Once again, because of the small population and sample size, each response thus obtained was treated individually or compiled and reported accordingly.
The true test of the cognitive organizer's effectiveness was considered to be whether it had utility in enabling community educators to delineate primary needs for community needs assessment purposes. The only means available to gauge the utility of the cognitive organizer rested with the community educators at Lakewood, Michigan who implemented the methodology. Simply stated, the cognitive organizer was considered to have utility or to be effective if, by implementing it in the allocated time, community educators at Lakewood, Michigan met with success in delineating and rank ordering primary community needs for assessment purposes. Whether it can be claimed that the primary community needs delineated through using the cognitive organizer are actually those of greatest importance in the community is questionable. This issue is addressed further in the conclusions and recommendations presented in Chapter V.

The independent observer

Mr. Brian Moroney, a Mott Fellow at the Western Michigan University CEDC was engaged as the independent observer. Moroney is an experienced community educator who, in studying for his Doctoral Degree at Western Michigan University, has completed advanced graduate courses in evaluation, group procedures, survey research, and community education. Prior to entering the Doctoral program, Moroney taught courses in community education at the Preston Institute of Technology at Melbourne, Australia. As an independent observer, Moroney was charged with responsibility to monitor the administration of the feedback instruments which followed each seminar. Additionally, he was requested to observe the presentations, the question and answer periods, the task group sessions, and the total seminar decision making sessions. Moroney was instructed to use the
items listed on the feedback instrument as a guide for observation purposes.

The present writer's reports and recommendations

Apart from personal observation, the present writer reviewed the tape recordings of the presentations, task group sessions and total seminar decision making sessions to prepare the reports and recommendations which appear in Chapter IV. The recommendations made pertain to the individual steps in implementing the cognitive organizer and, as a consequence, should not be confused with the overall recommendations made in Chapter V.

Summary

In this chapter the problem was briefly re-examined and a review of needs assessment literature was reported. The reader's attention was then directed to Appendices A, B, and C, the training packages developed to present and implement the cognitive organizer. The chapter concluded with a statement of the procedures adopted to monitor the presentation and implementation of the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan. In Chapter IV results, reports, and recommendations relating to the presentation and implementation of the cognitive organizer are presented.
CHAPTER IV

COGNITIVE ORGANIZER INTRODUCTION AND IMPLEMENTATION
RESULTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study's response to the problem of inadequate evaluation methodology in community education was the development of the cognitive organizer, a methodology designed to systematize the approach to entry point questions in assessing primary community needs.

This chapter opens with a description of the setting in which the cognitive organizer was presented and implemented. The remainder of the chapter reports the results of and recommendations regarding the presentation and implementation of the cognitive organizer. The results and recommendations are reported sequentially in three sections, each section dealing with one of the training packages attached as Appendices A, B, and C.

The Setting

Lakewood Community Education has been established for nine years with a major goal of service to people. Essentially, programs are delivered through a consortium of four schools, three elementary and one high school. The elementary schools are located at Clarkesville, Sunfield, and Woodland; and the high school is located at Lake Odessa. This cluster of four rural towns, encompassing a population of approximately 16,000, is situated between Lansing
and Grand Rapids, Michigan, adding a degree of urban influence to the area.

The LCEAC consists of 19 members chosen primarily because of their involvement with other human service agencies in the area. The intent of this selection process was to facilitate inter-agency cooperation. Additionally, the Director was mindful of the need to insure adequate representation in the LCEAC from each of the four towns.

The Lakewood Community Education staff included the Director, three administrative assistants, four community aides (one attached to each school), one office manager, and three secretaries.

By definition, advisory council members, administrative personnel, and staff were regarded in the study as community educators. Consequently, 31 community educators were invited by the President of the LCEAC and the Director to attend the seminars on January 10 and January 24, 1978 at which the training packages were presented. Only 16 Lakewood community educators attended the January 10 seminar, and of these, 15 attended the January 24 seminar.

The small numbers in attendance may have been a direct result of the extraordinary inclemency of Michigan's winter. Alternative explanations for the poor attendance must include the fact that advisory council members in general hold leadership positions in human service agencies in the community. Consequently, the additional time commitment required to attend the seminars may have clashed with personal schedules.

The poor response to the invitation to attend the seminars was not considered to be prohibiting. Obviously, a better response remained desirable, but such problems are continually encountered in
community education. Moreover, the adverse conditions which resulted were considered to constitute a realistic setting for the implementation of the cognitive organizer.

The Needs Assessment in Community Education Evaluation Training Seminar Results and Recommendations

Participant feedback instrument results

The means of the Likert scale responses to items on this instrument (Appendix D) are summarized in Table 1.

The instrument was administered to 16 seminar participants. Items 1 through 11 of the instrument related to the effectiveness of the training package presented in engendering participant understanding of the evaluation and needs assessment process.

The means of Likert scale responses to item 1 ($\bar{x} = 2.6$) and 2 ($\bar{x} = 4.3$) are indicative of perceived improvement of the participants' understanding of what evaluation is. Similarly, the means of Likert scale responses to item 4 ($\bar{x} = 2.8$) and item 5 ($\bar{x} = 3.8$) designate perceived improvement of the participants' understanding of what a need is; item 6 ($\bar{x} = 2.8$) and item 7 ($\bar{x} = 3.8$) denote perceived improvement of the participants' understanding of what needs assessment is. Items 10 ($\bar{x} = 3.0$) and 11 ($\bar{x} = 3.8$) signify perceived improvement of the participants' understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.

Items 3, 8, and 9 were not paired in the manner outlined above with participant perceptions of their understanding of the concepts involved prior to the seminar. Participant perceptions of this nature were not sought because the items were regarded as
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## Table 1
Means of Likert Scale Responses to Items on the Needs Assessment in Community Education Evaluation Training Seminar Participant Feedback Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Likert Scale Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what evaluation was</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what evaluation is.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in the evaluation process.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what a need was.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what a need is.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what needs assessment was.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what needs assessment is.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the difference between primary and secondary needs.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in conducting a needs assessment.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.  

As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.

I found the trainer's presentation to be helpful.

I found the printed handouts to be helpful.

I found the overhead transparencies to be helpful.

too process specific for a group which included lay citizens who were completely unschooled in the process prior to the seminar. The mean Likert scale responses to these items were as follows:

3. As a result of tonight's seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in the evaluation process. \( \bar{x} = 3.8 \)

8. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the difference between primary and secondary needs. \( \bar{x} = 4.1 \)

9. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in conducting a needs assessment. \( \bar{x} = 3.8 \)

Items 12, 13, and 14 pertained to the trainer's presentation of the training package, and materials prepared for and used during the presentation. Participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the
trainer's presentation, item 12, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.1. Similarly, participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the printed handouts used during the presentation, item 13, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.1. Finally, participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the overhead transparencies used during the presentation, item 14, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 3.5.

Item 15 sought participant recommendations of the seminar overall. The responses are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Summary of Participant Recommendations Pertaining to the Needs Assessment in Community Education Evaluation Training Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shorten the length of the seminar.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more community educators to attend.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use less technical language.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate opportunities for active participation in the learning process.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent observer's report

The independent observer reported the following:

1. The feedback instrument was administered ethically.
2. The setting for the seminar was excellent, the use of the library provided the right atmosphere for the meeting,
the participants were given an opportunity to mix informally during the evening meal prior to the seminar, careful attention was paid to seating arrangements, and a relaxed environment was generally engendered.

3. Preparation for the seminar was thorough; the multi-dimensional approach included the use of printed handouts, overhead transparencies, the chalkboard, charts, and tape recorders.

4. Participants were encouraged to seek clarification when needed and although it took some time for the first question to be asked a good flow of same ensued.

5. Given the fact that participants had little or no knowledge of the concepts and processes presented (clearly evidenced by the lack of response to the introductory questions asked by the trainer), it became obvious toward the end of the session that both the trainer and the training package were effective in engendering a better general understanding of the concepts and processes presented. The caliber of questions asked by participants improved considerably as the seminar progressed. Responses were adequate and generally given in non-technical language.

6. The content of the training package was largely theoretical. Presentation of the concepts and processes involved would be enhanced through the use, where possible, of simulated games and small group discussion sessions.

The present writer's report and recommendations

As stated in the text of the training package (Appendix A, page 84)
the seminar was basically a theoretical presentation of the needs assessment and evaluation processes. No apologies were made for the heavy emphasis on evaluation theory because it was felt that the needs assessment process could not be treated meaningfully out of context. The six participants who recommended shortening the length of the seminar, and the two participants who recommended the use of less technical language, were obviously affected by the theoretical nature of the presentation.

While the present writer was thus made cognizant of community educator reactions to this type of presentation, it is not recommended that a less theoretical treatment of the evaluation and needs assessment processes should be incorporated in the training package. Quite to the contrary, the very general overview of the processes encompassed in the training package is considered at best to be barely adequate. It is recommended that where possible, the training package should be presented in at least two sessions, one on each of the evaluation and needs assessment processes. The phrase "at least two sessions" is used with intent. Under optimum conditions the training package should be broken down into a series of sequential presentations. This contention is addressed further in Chapter V. Suffice it to say for the present that the "optimum conditions" referred to infer an enthusiastic and totally involved group of community educators, who are both able and prepared to contribute the personal time necessary for the training package to be thus presented.

As the seminar progressed it became obvious that, in some instances, the heavy emphasis on theory could be diminished. This was particularly evident in the presentation of the work plans for
evaluation (Appendix A4) and needs assessment (Appendix A6). The hierarchical nature of the work plans facilitated discussion of the higher order steps in detail. The lower order steps, presented in the form of questions to guide thinking throughout the processes, were examined briefly. In depth treatment of these questions was considered to be superfluous in a general presentation of the processes. Additionally, apart from questions relating to the introductory stage of the evaluation and needs assessment processes, the questions could be treated with greater relevance at later stages.

The feedback instrument results were better than expected in response to a theoretical presentation in which participants were largely inactive. The independent observer and participant recommendations regarding activity methods, although difficult to implement, are legitimate. It is recommended, therefore, that the training package be restructured to encompass opportunities for participant involvement in the learning process.

The Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Training Seminar
Results and Recommendations

Participant feedback instrument results

The means of the Likert scale responses to items on this instrument (Appendix E) are summarized in Table 3.

The instrument was administered to 16 seminar participants. One participant did not respond to items 8 and 9 and consequently an N of 15 was used to compute means of the Likert scale responses to these items. Only five participants were allocated agencies to contact for program information collection purposes. Consequently,
Table 3
Means of Likert Scale Responses to Items on the Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Training Seminar Participant Feedback Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Likert Scale Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prior to tonight's seminar I felt confident enough to participate in a community needs assessment.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I feel confident enough to participate in a community needs assessment.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps which must be followed to implement the pre-needs assessment strategy.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I found the identification of areas of primary need to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I found the identification of sub-groups which constitute my community to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I found the identification of other agencies in my community to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I believe that I shall be able to obtain the information required from the agencies allocated to me in the required time.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I found the trainer's presentation to be helpful.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I found the printed handouts to be helpful.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I found the overhead transparencies to be helpful.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These participants only were requested to respond to item 7 and N = 5 was used to compute the mean of the Likert scale responses to this item.
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The means of Likert scale responses to item 1 (\(\bar{x} = 2.5\)) and item 2 (\(\bar{x} = 4.3\)) are indicative of perceived improvement of the participants' confidence to participate in a community needs assessment.

Item 3,

As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps which must be followed to implement the pre-needs assessment strategy.

was not paired in the manner outlined above with participant perceptions of their understanding of the process involved prior to the seminar. Perceptions of this nature were not sought because the cognitive organizer was introduced for the first time at the seminar. The mean Likert scale response to item 3 was 4.1.

Items 4, 5, and 6 sought participant perceptions of the degree of difficulty encompassed in implementing the initial steps of the cognitive organizer. The mean Likert scale responses to these items were as follows:

4. I found the identification of areas of primary need to be a fairly simple process. \(\bar{x} = 3.6\)

5. I found the identification of sub-groups which constitute my community to be a fairly simple process. \(\bar{x} = 3.7\)

6. I found the identification of other agencies in my community to be a fairly simple process. \(\bar{x} = 3.6\)

The mean Likert scale response to item 7,

I believe that I shall be able to obtain the information required from the agencies allocated to me in the required time.

was 4.1. This item is discussed in greater detail in the present writer's report which follows.
Items 8, 9, and 10 pertained to the trainer's presentation of the training package and materials prepared for and used during the presentation. Participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the trainer's presentation, item 8, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.4. Similarly, participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the printed handouts used during the presentation, item 9, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.3. Finally, participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the overhead transparencies used during the presentation, item 10, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 3.5.

Item 11 sought participant recommendations of the seminar overall. The responses are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Summary of Participant Recommendations Pertaining to the Pre-Needs Assessment Strategy Training Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more community educators to attend.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorten the length of the seminar.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time for small task group work.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflicting recommendations were made by participants with respect to the amount of time taken to present the training package and implement the initial steps of the cognitive organizer. This issue is addressed further in the present writer's report and recom-
The independent observer's report

The independent observer reported the following:

1. The feedback instrument was administered ethically.

2. The setting remained the same as the previous session apart from the small group sessions which were incorporated. The nomination of group leaders by the trainer proved beneficial to the task group process. Small task group charges were clearly and adequately presented.

3. Preparation for the seminar was thorough; the multidimensional approach included the use of printed handouts, overhead transparencies, the chalkboard, charts, and tape recorders.

4. Participants were encouraged to seek clarification when needed and a good flow of questions and answers ensued.

5. The decision making procedure—small task group recommendations leading to total seminar decision making—was successful. In particular, the small task group process seemed to be facilitated by the nature of the tasks presented. After the first task group session participants saw the value of the small task group recommendations in facilitating total seminar decision making.

6. Time restraints for task group sessions were strictly adhered to. The trainer made it clear that groups would have to remain on task to successfully complete the various tasks in the time span allotted.
The present writer's report and recommendations

Participants seemed less threatened and much more at ease with the concepts and processes presented in this training package than they were during the first seminar. This became markedly evident during the task group and total seminar decision making sessions.

The first step to implement the cognitive organizer, a statement of the purpose of the community needs assessment, had been accomplished prior to the seminar. The purpose identified was to establish broad goal areas for Lakewood Community Education.

The second step, adaptation and adoption of primary community need areas, was accompanied by a stimulating discussion of the purpose of schooling. Some participants questioned the relevance of moral needs, perceiving these to be more rightfully the realm of the family and the church. It was pointed out, however, that the categorization to be adopted had to be all encompassing to enable the cognitive organizer to represent the total potential areas of primary need in the community. The task group recommendations that were adopted by the total seminar group were as follows:

1. The descriptor "spiritual" was added to "moral" because participants perceived the former to be related to but not fully subsumed by the latter.

2. The descriptor "cultural" was added to "aesthetic" to facilitate greater citizen understanding during the needs assessment process.

3. The descriptor "recreational" was added to "physical" because participants perceived the former to be related
to but not fully subsumed by the latter.

The wisdom of some of the decisions thus made might be challenged. Recreational needs, for example, could be construed to relate better with social needs. It was considered, however, that the categorization adopted had to be one which the participants deemed to be relevant to their community, and one which they understood and could interpret to their community.

The third step, adopting a categorization of sub-groups which constituted the community, proved troublesome. Possible sub-groups were brainstormed in the total seminar group and the problem of how many of these to encompass in the categorization arose. By increasing the number of sub-groups it was felt that more information would be available for later work in delineating primary need areas for assessment purposes. At the same time it was felt that by increasing the number of sub-groups the cognitive organizer would become cumbersome to deal with at later stages. The total seminar group decided to restrict the number of sub-groups of the community to six or seven on this occasion, and to expand on these when using the process in the future. It was interesting to note lay citizens concerning themselves in this manner with complex issues such as loss of information through aggregation of data.

Task group recommendations included categorization of community sub-groups by "age group" and by "daytime activity." The third task group failed to make a recommendation, but one of its members suggested an amalgamation of the two categorizations recommended by the other groups. The resulting categorization—pre-school children, K-12 students, homemakers, employed citizens, unemployed citizens, and retired
citizens—was perceived to be a combination of the "age group" and "daytime activity" categorizations recommended.

The Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix which resulted from placing the primary need areas along the horizontal axis and the community sub-groups up the vertical axis is shown in Figure 1.

The task of adopting a categorization of community sub-groups may have been facilitated by providing examples of categorizations such as those which emanated from the small groups. It was decided prior to the seminar, however, that participants could become preoccupied by the examples provided, a factor which could prove detrimental to the development of a categorization relevant to the Lakewood community.

The fourth step, identification of other human service agencies which offered programs in the community, was facilitated by Lakewood Community Education's publication Lakewood Areawide Directory of Human Services 1976-77. This publication listed 136 agencies, contact persons within each agency, and a general description of the programs offered by the agencies in the community. A random sample of 20 of the agencies listed in the directory was drawn prior to the seminar. These agencies were contacted to check the accuracy of the program information presented in the directory. The check resulted in two minor program changes. As a consequence it was decided to collect program information only from those agencies which were not listed in the directory.

Small group brainstorming revealed an additional 49 agencies that were not listed in the directory. To approximate the program information collection conditions which might normally apply in implementing the cognitive organizer, five participants were randomly chosen to collect the necessary program information from these agencies.
Figure 1

Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF PRIMARY NEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY SUB-GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant recommendations regarding the amount of time taken to present the training package and implement the initial steps of the cognitive organizer were conflicting. Two participants recommended shortening the seminar and two recommended allowing more time for small task group work, thereby lengthening the seminar overall. Small task group time allocations were strictly adhered to and some frustration may have resulted when tasks were not accomplished in the time allotted. On two occasions groups were observed to be "off task" by discussing program alternatives instead of recommending a categorization of primary community needs on the first occasion, and by discussing the programs of agencies rather than brain storming a list of agencies on the second occasion. While the task groups functioned well overall despite participant unfamiliarity with the task group process, it is recommended nevertheless, that participants be trained in task group procedures, such as those suggested by Betz (1974) as a preparatory step in implementing the cognitive organizer.

The Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Implementation Results and Recommendations

Participant feedback instrument results

The means of Likert scale responses to items on this instrument (Appendix F) are summarized in Table 5.

The instrument was administered to 15 seminar participants. One participant did not respond to item 7 and consequently an N of 14 was used to compute the mean Likert scale response to this item. Only five participants were allocated agencies to contact for program information collection purposes. As a consequence, these participants
## Table 5
Means of Likert Scale Responses to Items on the Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Implementation Seminar Participant Feedback Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Likert Scale Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I was able to collect the information from the agencies allocated to me in the required time without difficulty.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I found the letter of introduction to be helpful.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I found the printed booklet to be helpful.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I found the process of placing the programs of agencies (other than Lakewood Community Education) on the matrix to be fairly simple.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I found the matrix to be valuable in helping me to organize in my mind, the total potential areas of need in my community.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I found the process of determining where programs are duplicated unnecessarily to be fairly simple.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I found the process of determining where needs are being poorly or insufficiently met by existing programs to be fairly simple.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I found the process of rank ordering the cells of the matrix in which greatest needs exist to be fairly simple.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I found the process of making decisions regarding the action we should take with respect to the ordered cells to be fairly simple.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel confident that I can participate further in conducting the community needs assessment.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I feel confident that I can participate further in the evaluation of our community education program.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only were requested to respond to items 1 through 5 and \( N = 5 \) was used to compute the mean Likert scale response to items 1, 3, 4, and 5 accordingly.

The mean Likert scale response to item 1,

I was able to collect the information from the agencies allocated to me in the time required without difficulty.

was 3.2. Item 2 sought open ended explanations of the difficulties encountered in the program information collection process. The three responses thus obtained all related to difficulty in identifying telephone numbers and contact persons within the agencies involved. Despite these difficulties, all five participants responsible for program information collection reported successful achievement of their tasks.

Participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the letter of introduction, item 3, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 3.8. Similarly, participant perceptions of the helpfulness of the printed booklet, item 4, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 3.8. Two participants remarked that the booklet was helpful when explaining the community needs assessment to agency personnel. They reported additionally, however, that the summary of the community needs assessment process encompassed in the booklet was useful to them personally in conceptualizing the total evaluation process.

The mean Likert scale response to item 5,

I found the process of placing the programs of agencies (other than Lakewood Community Education) on the matrix to be fairly simple.

was 3.7. Additional comments regarding the matrix placement of
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human service agency programs are made in the present writer's report and recommendations.

Item 7 sought participant perceptions of the value of the matrix in enabling them to conceptualize the total potential areas of need in their community. The mean Likert scale response to this item was 4.5, the highest mean response to any item on all three of the participant feedback instruments.

Items 8, 10, 12, and 14 sought participant perceptions of the degree of difficulty involved in implementing steps of the cognitive organizer. Following each of these items participants were requested to explain any difficulties encountered. Additional comments relating to each of these steps are presented in the present writer's report and recommendations.

The mean Likert scale response to item 8,

I found the process of determining where programs are duplicated unnecessarily to be fairly simple.

was 2.9. Open ended explanations of difficulty encountered with this task included four requests for more time.

The mean Likert scale response to item 10,

I found the process of determining where needs are being poorly or insufficiently met by existing programs to be fairly simple.

was 4.1. Open ended explanations of difficulty encountered included the comment "I found it necessary to refer to the whole emotional column rather than particular cells within the column." Requests
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for extra time to undertake this task were made by two participants.

The mean Likert scale response to item 12,

I found the process of rank ordering the cells of the matrix in which greatest needs exist to be fairly simple,

was 3.7. Open ended explanations of difficulty encountered included two requests for extra time to complete the small group task.

The mean Likert scale response to item 14,

I found the process of making decisions regarding the action we should take with respect to the rank ordered cells to be fairly simple.

was 3.4. Open ended explanations of difficulty encountered included one request for extra time and the comment "I think we have decided on the right action in each cell."

Items 16 and 17 sought participant perceptions of their confidence to participate further in the needs assessment and evaluation processes respectively. Participant perceptions of their confidence to participate further in conducting the community needs assessment, item 16, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.1. Similarly, participant perceptions of their confidence to participate in the evaluation of their community education program, item 17, resulted in a mean Likert scale response of 4.3.

Item 18 sought participant recommendations pertaining to the seminar overall. The responses are summarized in Table 6.
Table 6
Summary of Participant Recommendations Pertaining to the Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Implementation Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more time for small group work.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more community educators to attend.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorten the length of the seminar.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent observer's report

The independent observer reported the following:

1. The feedback instrument was administered ethically.
2. Careful attention was again given to seminar setting and preparation.
3. The task group and total seminar decision making sessions were generally successful. Difficulty was encountered in identifying cell areas where unnecessary duplication of programs existed, and more time should be allocated to this task as a consequence. Similarly, more time could be allocated to the task of recommending matrix cells where primary needs remain unmet, poorly met or insufficiently met by existing programs.
4. Participants were obviously surprised by the number of programs offered in their community. Many discovered programs of interest to them personally, or remarked that they knew
of people who had been seeking programs listed on the matrix.

5. At the conclusion of the seminar it was obvious that participants believed that they had delineated and rank ordered the primary community needs of greatest importance to them for assessment purposes.

The present writer's report and recommendations

The most pleasing aspect of the seminar was the enthusiastic and business-like approach displayed by participants to the many and varied small group tasks and total seminar decision making sessions. The incidental questions asked during the summaries of previous seminars were well answered, indicating greater knowledge of the total evaluation process than was evident at the outset of the first seminar.

The program information gathering process was undertaken successfully by the five participants randomly selected to perform this task. Quite often the participants involved recommended multiple placement of programs on the matrix and no changes were found to be necessary to the recommendations thus made. Changes were recommended and adopted with respect to the matrix placement of four programs from the Lakewood Areawide Directory of Human Services 1976-77.

A total of 781 matrix placements of programs were made. Of these 134 matrix placements were made of Lakewood Community Education programs. In Figure 2 the numbers of programs placed in each cell of the Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix are shown.

Considerable difficulty was encountered with respect to the next step in implementing the cognitive organizer—that of identifying the
Figure 2

Human Service Agency Program Placement on the Lakewod Community Primary Needs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retired Citizens</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Home-makers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Pre-school Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>59 (11)</td>
<td>62 (8)</td>
<td>72 (11)</td>
<td>79 (12)</td>
<td>58 (16)</td>
<td>19 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
<td>18 (2)</td>
<td>17 (1)</td>
<td>31 (2)</td>
<td>23 (5)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>14 (1)</td>
<td>16 (2)</td>
<td>4 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>16 (3)</td>
<td>11 (0)</td>
<td>17 (2)</td>
<td>25 (2)</td>
<td>16 (8)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIMARY NEEDS AREAS**

**Note 1.** The first number in each cell indicates how many human service agency (other than Lakewood Community Education) program matrix placements were made per cell.

**Note 2.** The number in parenthesis in each cell indicates how many Lakewood Community Education program matrix placements were made per cell.
matrix cells in which existing programs were considered to be duplicated unnecessarily. The program information obtained from the Lakewood Area-wide Directory of Human Services 1976-77 was difficult to access and insufficient time was allocated for the task. Moreover, participants were obviously overawed by the number of program placements made on the matrix. The feasibility of undertaking this task using the seminar format must be brought severely into question even under optimum conditions of easily accessible data and adequate time allocation.

After examining selected cells in small groups, the total seminar group decided to refer the task to the Director who was made responsible for establishing an ad hoc committee to research each cell area, and report accordingly at subsequent meetings. This course of action seemed relevant considering the magnitude of the task. Consequently, it is recommended the above option be incorporated within this step in implementing the cognitive organizer. It is not recommended that the original step should be omitted altogether. Participants gained knowledge of the matrix in undertaking the task, and Lakewood Community Education programs were examined in the light of competing programs.

The next step in implementing the cognitive organizer, determining where needs were being poorly or insufficiently met by existing programs, was achieved with relative ease. As small group recommendations were made they were collated on an overhead transparency of the Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix. The results thus obtained are shown in Figure 3. The leaders of groups A and B reported that participants found it difficult to isolate particular cells within the emotional and aesthetic-cultural columns. There was overlap between the group C recommendations in the moral-spiritual column and the group A and B
### Figure 3
Summary of Small Group Recommendations Regarding the Matrix
Cells in which Primary Needs Remained Poorly or Insufficiently Met by Existing Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Moral</th>
<th>Spiritual</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Retired Citizens**
- **Unemployed**
- **Employed**
- **Homemakers**
- **Students**
- **Pre-school Children**

Note: A, B, and C denote the recommendations of separate task groups.
recommendations in the emotional column.

The task groups recommended similar rank orders of the cells identified in Figure 3. This process was facilitated when the members of group C agreed to switch their recommendations from the moral-spiritual column to the emotional column. The results of the total seminar group decision making session which ensued are shown in Figure 4. Although the emotional needs of homemakers was singled out as being of prime importance, the participants regarded the entire emotional column as the greatest need area in their community. Similarly, the aesthetic-cultural column was rank ordered as a unit.

The next step in the implementation of the cognitive organizer required participants to decide the action that should be taken with respect to each rank ordered primary need area. Task group recommendations resulted in the following total seminar group decisions:

1. Participants noted that they were not aware of many existing programs in the general emotional area. They conjectured, therefore, that community members were probably equally unaware of these programs. As a consequence, it was decided to design items for the assessment to gauge community awareness of existing programs.

2. The Director advised participants that a large scale assessment of vocational needs was currently being conducted by the Michigan Employment Security Commission. Consequently, assessment of the vocational needs of employed and unemployed citizens was deferred until the results of the Michigan Employment Security Commission assessment were available.
Figure 4
Areas of Primary Need Rank Ordered According to Participant Perceptions of the Importance of Each Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Groups</th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Spiritual</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired Citizens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-makers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school Children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Community educators at Lakewood, Michigan preferred the tied ranks which appear in the emotional and aesthetic-cultural columns of this figure.
3. The participants regarded homemaking as a vocation and agreed to assess needs in this area accordingly. Additionally, homemakers were perceived to have vocational needs pertaining to part-time positions and additional work that could be undertaken in the home. It was agreed that the assessment should encompass items to determine vocational needs relative to each of these forms of employment.

4. It was agreed that the vocational needs of students should be included in the assessment.

5. Participants agreed to assess the cultural-aesthetic needs of the community as a whole. It was decided additionally, that aesthetic-cultural needs for both participatory and spectator activities should be assessed.

A discussion of potential funding sources for possible program development in the aesthetic-cultural area ensued. It was agreed that the matrix provided program information which was potentially valuable in preparing funding proposals.

The next step in implementing the cognitive organizer required the Director to present a report of the preliminary assessment of secondary needs such as the availability of finances, instructors, facilities and administrative support. This information was required by participants to enable them to determine a cut-off point for the assessment in the primary need areas delineated. It was pointed out that data collection is an expensive process, and that community educators lose their credibility if they collect data upon which they cannot take any action because of known resource restrictions.
The Director reported that secondary needs were met to such an extent that program development was feasible in each of the primary need areas listed for assessment purposes.

As a consequence, the final step to implement the cognitive organizer was readily accomplished. No cut-off point had to be established in the primary need areas listed above, and the assessment was operationalized in each of these areas.

Summary

In this chapter the setting in which the cognitive organizer was introduced and implemented was described. Results, reports, and recommendations relating to each of the training packages used at the seminars were then presented. In Chapter V conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made with respect to the structure and utility of the cognitive organizer.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations in this chapter will be presented in the following sequence:

1. The problem will be re-examined and the study's response to it will be reviewed.
2. The recommendations made in Chapter IV regarding the individual steps in the use of the cognitive organizer will be summarized.
3. Recommendations will be made with respect to the structure and overall implementation of the cognitive organizer.
4. Conclusions will be drawn regarding the utility of the cognitive organizer in delineating primary community needs for assessment purposes.
5. Recommendations for further research and development of the cognitive organizer will be made.

Review of the Problem and the Study's Response

The problem delineated in the study was the inadequacy of evaluation methodology in community education. In Chapter I it was established that evaluation is widely practiced in community education. It was also established, however, that the process is practiced informally, and that methodological development in community education
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evaluation has not paralleled the ready acceptance accorded to the process by community educators. In particular, methodologies reflecting community involvement in the evaluation process have not been developed.

Because of the broad scope of the problem the study's response to it was limited to methodological development at the entry point of the total evaluation process, that of community needs assessment. Specifically, the objectives for the study were:

1. To develop a cognitive organizer of community needs as a methodology to enable community educators to (a) conceptualize the total potential areas from which needs can arise in their communities, and (b) delineate areas of need for assessment purposes.

2. To train community educators at Lakewood, Michigan in evaluation theory and in the use of the cognitive organizer.

3. To implement the cognitive organizer at Lakewood, Michigan under independent observation with a view to suggesting improvement in its structure and utility.

Recommendations Regarding the Individual Steps in the use of the Cognitive Organizer

In Chapter IV the following recommendations were made with respect to the individual steps in the use of the cognitive organizer:

1. Community educators should be trained in task group procedures as a prerequisite to the introduction and implementation of the methodology.

2. The Needs Assessment in Community Education Evaluation Training Package (Appendix A) should be presented in two
sessions, one on the evaluation process and the other on the needs assessment process. Further recommendations are made regarding this issue in the next section of this chapter.

3. The Needs Assessment in Community Education Evaluation Training Package should be restructured to encompass opportunities for active participation in the learning process.

4. In the Pre-needs Assessment Strategy Implementation Training Package (Appendix B) more time should be allocated to the task of identifying the matrix cells in which present human service agency programs are regarded as being unnecessarily duplicated.

5. In the step outlined in 4 above, the option of referring the task to the Director or an ad hoc committee should be incorporated.

Recommendations Regarding the Structure and the Overall Implementation of the Cognitive Organizer

Under optimum conditions, the cognitive organizer should be presented and implemented per the medium of a series of sequential training packages. The slide-tape format with accompanying trainer manuals could be utilized to advantage for this purpose. The training packages, each of 20 to 30 minutes duration, could be incorporated into routine advisory council meetings for several months prior to the scheduled date for the community needs assessment. Under these circumstances the community education staff would be required to attend advisory council meetings. This issue will be discussed in greater detail later in this section.
The series of sequential training packages should include the following:

1. A package to orient the Director and/or the trainer to the evaluation process in general and to the series of packages as a whole.

2. A package to orient participants to the evaluation process in general and to the series of packages as a whole.

3. A package to train participants in the task group process.

4. A series of two or three packages to present the evaluation process as a whole and to demonstrate the contextual placement of community needs assessment in the process.

5. A package to determine the purpose of the community needs assessment and to introduce the cognitive organizer.

6. A package to identify primary need areas and community sub-groups relevant to the community, and to demonstrate matrix placement of programs.

7. A package to identify human service agencies, outline information gathering procedures, and allocate agencies to participants.

8. A package to familiarize participants with the matrix, and to allocate cells to individuals or ad hoc committees for research purposes.

9. A package to identify matrix cells where programs are duplicated unnecessarily and where greatest unmet, poorly met or insufficiently met needs exist.

10. A package to aid the Director in preparing a preliminary assessment of secondary needs.
11. A package to rank order need areas and to determine desirable action with respect to each area.

12. A package to determine the cut-off point for the community needs assessment and to orient participants to relevant issues in operationalizing the assessment.

Although the sequence suggested should be followed, it is possible that more than one package could be presented per meeting.

The "optimum conditions" referred to in suggesting the above format to implement the cognitive organizer obviously infer an enthusiastic and totally involved group of participants. Such participants would have to be both able and willing to commit the personal time necessary to implement the cognitive organizer using this format. Presentation of the training packages at regular advisory council meetings could decrease the time burden to some extent. Under these circumstances staff members would be required to attend advisory council meetings. On some occasions separate daytime presentations could be made. Additionally, the Director could arrange for staff members required to attend advisory council meetings to be released from daytime duty on a pro rata basis. Allowances of this nature could be necessary at later stages of the needs assessment process. Staff members, for example, could be involved in conducting survey interviews out of normal working hours.

Over-riding the time problem is the issue of participant willingness to become involved in the needs assessment and total evaluation processes. It was claimed in Chapter II that advisory councils have often been treated as "rubber stamping" groups in community education. The implementation of the cognitive organizer, however, is contingent upon shared decision making by all community educators. Moreover, continued involvement of this nature is advocated for community educa-
tors, advisory council members and staff alike, throughout the entire evaluation process. In this elevated role community educators could become involved to the extent necessary for the cognitive organizer to be implemented in the format recommended.

Conclusions Regarding the Utility of the Cognitive Organizer in Delineating Primary Community Needs for Assessment Purposes

It cannot be argued that the primary community needs delineated when the cognitive organizer is implemented are truly those of greatest importance in the community. Indeed, it is difficult if not impossible to conceive of a methodology which could be utilized for this purpose reliably.

The personal values of individual community educators and those groups represented by these individuals must be recognized as sources of bias, and the needs delineated may reflect these biases accordingly. Moreover, although attempts are made to establish "representative" advisory councils it is probably impossible for a council to be fully representative of the community it serves. To be fully representative the advisory council would have to include members of all age groups, minority groups, vocational groups, interest groups and the like. By expanding its membership in this manner, the resulting council could be very cumbersome. Moreover, full representation could be claimed only if the entire community was involved. It is likely, therefore, that some groups may remain "without a voice" on the council, and the needs delineated may reflect this source of bias accordingly.

Despite these factors it is claimed that the cognitive organizer does have utility in delineating primary needs for assessment.
purposes. This claim is made in the light of the following evidence:

1. System and sequence are introduced into the process of delineating primary needs for assessment purposes when the cognitive organizer is implemented.

2. A conceptualization of the total potential areas of primary needs which can arise in the community is made possible.

3. Specific kinds of needs for designated sub-groups of the community can be identified.

4. Community educators are directed by the cognitive organizer to regard needs beyond their own, their families, and friends.

5. Finally, and most importantly, the perceptions of community educators who are, in the first place, community members are sought.

The claim that the cognitive organizer has utility in delineating primary needs for assessment purposes can be stated as either of the following alternatives:

1. Broad goal areas have been established. Needs in these areas can now be assessed to provide information for generating relevant program alternatives.

2. An entry point to the total evaluation process has been established. In particular, the entry point questions pertaining to the community needs assessment process have been established and addressed.
Recommendations for Further Research and Development of the Cognitive Organizer

The problem identified for the study was the inadequacy of evaluation methodology in community education. Because of the broad scope of the problem the study's response was limited to methodological development and implementation at the entry point of the total evaluation process, that of community needs assessment.

It was claimed in Chapter II that the cognitive organizer developed in the study could be applied in school based and non-school based community education settings. It is recommended, therefore, that the cognitive organizer should be implemented in a non-school based community education setting. Moreover, the cognitive organizer should be implemented in predominantly urban and suburban settings, both school based and non-school based in nature.

The optimum conditions for implementation of the cognitive organizer were discussed earlier in this chapter. Additionally, recommendations were made regarding the individual steps to implement the cognitive organizer and the format in which it should be presented.

A further recommendation pertaining to the implementation of the cognitive organizer is in order. To encourage greater reliance on a data base for decision making in community education, the human service agency program information collected should take into account the numbers of participants enrolled per program and the numbers of participants currently on waiting lists. This information would assist community educators in the difficult steps of identifying matrix cells where programs are regarded as being unnecessarily duplicated, and in
discerning the matrix cells where needs remain unmet, poorly met or insufficiently met.

The cognitive organizer should be regarded as a suggested approach to the entry point questions which confront community educators at the outset of the community needs assessment process. Alternative approaches reflecting community involvement and shared decision making in the process should be developed, trialed, and disseminated. Development of this nature would provide community educators with an array of methodologies from which to select an approach compatible with available human and physical resources.

As stated above, the cognitive organizer was developed in response to problems confronted by community educators at the very outset of the total evaluation process. Although trite, it is nonetheless necessary to state that methodological developments are needed to facilitate community involvement and shared decision making at subsequent stages of the evaluation process. Indeed, further methodological developments are required to assist community educators in operationalizing community needs assessments. Subsequently, community education researchers should direct their attention to methodological developments to guide community educators, and to facilitate community involvement and shared decision making in input, process, and product evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION

I am pleased to be able to participate with you in planning and conducting an evaluation of your community education program. Your decision to evaluate will, I am sure, lead to programs that are beneficial to your community. Indeed, we may find this to be the case at present, but improvement is probably always possible, and one of the prime purposes of evaluation is to provide information to facilitate program improvement.

I would like to present, at this point, a general overview of the activities you will be involved in during the next two weeks. These are as follows:

1. Tonight's introductory and very general seminar on needs assessment in community education.
2. A training seminar to introduce the pre-needs assessment strategy that I have developed.
3. Collection of information about the programs of human service agencies operating in your community.
4. A working seminar to determine the community needs you will assess.

The Present State of Community Education Evaluation

During the past eighteen months I have been associated with the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center. I
have noticed during this period, that more requests for assistance are
received from field based community educators in the general area of
evaluation than in any other component part of the community education
process. Indeed, Boyd's\(^1\) recent national investigation of current prac-
tices in community education evaluation revealed that:

> Evaluation is more prominent and wide ranging
> activity in community education programs than
> in most other human services.

Boyd\(^2\) further reported, however, that:

> It is the amount rather than the technology of
> evaluation that stands out in the field of community
> education.

Herein lies what I perceive to be the essence of the problem
that community educators are encountering with evaluation—-not whether
to evaluate, but how to evaluate. Methodological development has not
kept abreast of the ready acceptance that has been accorded to the
process. Please turn to Appendix A1 in which I have collated many of
the reasons for the present inadequacy of community education evaluation
methodology.

Needs Assessment in Community Education
Evaluation Seminar Objectives

Many reasons beyond those listed could be expounded, but the
purpose of tonight's seminar is to seek solutions to the problem more
so than listing reasons for its existence. With this purpose in mind,
I propose the following objectives:

1. To gain an understanding of what evaluation is.
2. To gain an understanding of the steps normally followed
   in conducting an evaluation.
3. To gain an understanding of what a need is and what needs assessment is.

4. To gain an understanding of the difference between primary and secondary needs.

5. To gain an understanding of the steps normally followed in conducting a needs assessment.

6. To gain an understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.

To achieve the above objectives I have prepared a series of printed handouts and overhead transparencies to supplement my presentation. I trust that you will find these helpful as we progress through the seminar. Additionally, I urge you to interrupt me if you require additional explanation. It was pointed out in Appendix A1 that community educators have often avoided evaluation because they perceive it to be a complicated and immense process. Your perception may fall into this category if you fail to seek clarification when needed.

Community Involvement in Community Education

Before turning to the objectives I would like to stress my belief that the community involvement in community education is not possible unless decision making is a process shared by staff and the community through its elected advisory council. This assertion is of paramount importance with respect to the pre-needs assessment strategy which will be presented to you later this evening. The strategy is totally dependent upon your involvement and shared decision making. I firmly believe that your involvement in evaluation is an exercise
in futility unless you share the responsibility for planning and implementing the process, and decision making regarding its findings.

Objective 1. What is Evaluation?

Until recently evaluators were troubled by the same problem which confronts community educators today—the lack of a universally accepted definition. Consensus now exists amongst evaluation theorists and practitioners that evaluation is a process used to systematically investigate the merit or worth of an object. This definition appears in Appendix A2 along with the definitions of other terms with which you should become familiar. Please turn to Appendix A2 and I shall expand on the definitions that are relevant at this point. You will note that I start with a definition of community education which was proposed recently by the Mott Foundation. Both "identification of community needs" and "sharing of power in decision making" figure prominently in this definition.

I intend to use "community educator" to collectively describe administrators, staff, and advisory council members. Additionally, "community education program" will be used to describe program, process, and service in community education. Program versus process orientation in community education is an issue which we shall be addressing at a later stage.

In preparation for this seminar I sought a more specific definition of evaluation—one which relates the process to decision making. Stufflebeam's (1970) definition has been adopted accordingly in both long and short forms.
Objective 2. Steps in Conducting an Evaluation

The better known models for educational evaluation include those of Scriven, Stake, Provus, and Stufflebeam. To examine the steps normally followed in conducting an evaluation I have arbitrarily chosen the Stufflebeam Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model. I am willing to discuss the relative merits of the other models if you so desire. My choice was based on my belief that the CIPP model best presents evaluation as a systematic and sequential process, thus providing the guidelines necessary for citizen participation. I do not contend, however, that we must follow the CIPP model with slavish devotion. Community education differs markedly from one community to another and evaluations should be designed to reflect these differences accordingly.

The acronym, CIPP, requires additional explanation. Please turn to Appendix A3 in which I have attempted to illustrate the four types of evaluation which Stufflebeam proposes to service four types of decision making. You have already decided to evaluate your program. Your starting point is context evaluation which basically subsumes needs assessment, thus answering one of our later objectives, The Relationship Between Evaluation and Needs Assessment.

In Appendix A4 I have attempted to simplify the steps normally followed to conduct an evaluation using the CIPP model. A myriad of steps and substeps are available to guide you through the process systematically and sequentially. Do not be overawed by the seeming immensity of the process. If you allow this to happen you will join the many who have opted out of formal evaluation for this reason. I would like to go through Appendix A4 with you and to answer any questions you may have as we proceed.
Objective 3. What is a Need?

Another reason for adopting the CIPP model will now become apparent. Stufflebeam recently conducted an extensive study of needs assessment and determined that four distinct definitions of need are currently in use. These are presented in Appendix A2 along with the dictionary-like definition which Stufflebeam proposes.

The definitions of needs assessment which follow are presented in the same dictionary-like terminology. The specific definition proposed is really an abbreviation of an operationalized needs assessment.

Please remember that during this and the forthcoming seminars the terms "need" and "needs assessment" will be used in reference to education.

Objective 4. The Difference Between Primary and Secondary Needs

The existence of primary and secondary needs is a relatively new development in needs assessment. Stufflebeam contends that primary needs in education derive from the purpose of schooling, which, he argues, is to promote human growth and development. In Appendix A5 I have listed the growth and development areas from which Stufflebeam maintains primary needs derive. These areas, or others like them, are extremely important in the pre-needs assessment strategy that I am proposing for use at Lakewood. I shall be asking you at a later stage to consider their relevance to community education, and whether you believe that they encompass all possible needs which may arise in your community. If we were unrealistic we could conduct a needs assessment in this community.
and direct our entire resources, both physical and human, at generating programs to meet primary needs. Such a situation would be idyllic, but, as is always the case, we are confronted with restraints. Financial limitations will certainly restrain our activities, as will limited human and physical resources.

If we accept that the seven growth and development areas listed constitute primary needs, what then are secondary needs? Stufflebeam claims that secondary needs are those which "are derived from and contribute to fulfilling primary needs."15 By returning to our discussion of restraints, the difference between the two sets of needs can be illustrated. You may determine that a primary need exists in this community for vocational programs to aid a substantial group of unemployed citizens. The potential program participants are unemployed so you may defeat your purpose by charging tuition fees. Consequently, you must find additional or alternative sources of funding. Perhaps the excess tuition fees from other programs can be rechannelled to cater for the proposed vocational programs. In other words, the availability of funds is a secondary need deriving from and contributing to the primary need for vocational classes.

Other examples of secondary needs in community education include efficiency in administration, adequate facilities, staff morale, the availability of instructors, effective communication, and enthusiastic teaching. It is obvious that secondary needs such as those listed above must be identified, assessed, and met if programs are to be successful in servicing the primary needs of the community.
Objective 5. Steps in the Needs Assessment Process

I suggested earlier that Stufflebeam's specific definition of needs assessment can be regarded as a definition of the process in action. In Appendix A6 I have suggested steps to conduct a community needs assessment in accordance with this definition. Additionally, I have listed a series of questions after each step to guide your thinking throughout the process. While I do not advocate slavish devotion to these steps, I do suggest that they provide a potentially useful guide. Stufflebeam's checklist for designing needs assessments, from which the steps and questions have largely been drawn, is a comprehensive source of additional information which should prove invaluable to you in planning and conducting community needs assessments. I would like to examine Appendix A6 with you to expand on each of the suggested steps and to clarify where needed.

Objective 6. The Relationship Between Needs Assessment and Evaluation

I have already pointed out that needs assessment is an integral component of the total evaluation process. In the CIPP model needs assessment was referred to as "context evaluation." As such, needs assessment is the type of evaluation which provides information to service goal setting decisions. In community education this means that needs assessment is the process used to establish broad goals. Both primary and secondary needs must be assessed, the former to provide direction for developing program alternatives, and the latter to evaluate the feasibility of each alternative.
When I speak about evaluating program alternatives I am really referring to input evaluation as subsumed by the CIPP model. The pre-needs assessment strategy which will be introduced in the next seminar session does not apply to input evaluation. Nevertheless, I would like you to refer to Appendix A7 in which needs assessment is juxtaposed in a cycle of planning and evaluation\textsuperscript{17} of community education. If needs assessment can be likened to context evaluation, where do input, process, and product evaluation fit into the cycle?
APPENDIX A1

FACTORs CONTRIBUTING TO THE LACK OF SOUND METHODOLOGICAL TECHNIQUES FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION EVALUATION

1. Community education training has not traditionally incorporated courses in evaluation.
2. Community education staff, therefore, are not familiar with the established evaluation methodologies of other fields.
3. Few attempts have been made to involve advisory council members in the evaluation process. As a consequence, methodologies reflecting community involvement which should have resulted, have not been developed.
4. Until recently funding agencies have accepted such informal methods as tabulations of programs and participants as adequate evaluation of community education programs.
5. Community educators in general have not made budgetary allocations for evaluation purposes.
6. There exists a dire shortage of personnel trained and experienced in community education evaluation.
7. Community educators have perceived evaluation to be a complex and immense process.
8. Community education encompasses a wide scope of activities. As a consequence, the complexity and magnitude which community educators perceive in the evaluation process has been magnified.
accordingly.

9. Community education evaluation model development has been hampered by the diversity of programs which exists from one community to another.

10. Community educators have been troubled by their inability to determine an entry point into formal evaluation.
APPENDIX A2

EXPLANATION OF TERMS USED

Community Education

Community education is the process which, as related primarily to learning, insures community involvement in identification of community needs, utilization of resources and sharing of power in decision making, and affects, strengthens and enriches the quality of living of individuals and their community.

Evaluation

Universally accepted definition

Evaluation is the process of systematically investigating the merit or worth of an object, e.g., a program or project.

The Stufflebeam definition

Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives.

The Stufflebeam definition in operational terms

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
for the purposes of decision making and accountability.

Need

Discrepancy view

A need is a discrepancy between desired performance and observed
or predicted performance.

Democratic view

A need is a change desired by a majority of some reference group.

Diagnostic view

A need is something whose absence or deficiency proves harmful.

Analytic view

A need is the direction in which improvement can be predicted to
occur given information about current status.

The Stufflebeam definition

A need is something that can be shown to be necessary or
useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose.

A defensible purpose is one that meets certain ethical
and utility criteria or at least is not counter-productive
in relation to these criteria.

A necessary thing is one that is required to achieve a
a particular purpose.
Something that is useful helps but may not be essential in fulfilling a purpose.

Needs Assessment

General definition

A needs assessment is the process of determining what things are needed to serve some worthy purpose.

Specific definition

Needs assessment is a process for:
identifying and examining the purposes against which needs are to be determined;
getting these purposes modified if they are found improper or flawed;
identifying the things that are requisite and useful for serving the validated purposes;
assessing the extent that the identified needs are met or unmet;
rating the importance of these met and unmet needs; and,
aiding the audience for the needs assessment to apply the findings in formulating goals, choosing procedures, and assessing progress.
### CIPP -- CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, PRODUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evaluation</th>
<th>Personnel Primarily Responsible</th>
<th>Types of Decisions Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT EVALUATION</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td><strong>PLANNING DECISIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs assessment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determining broad goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determining priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT EVALUATION</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRUCTURING DECISIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What program alternatives exist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What process alternatives exist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the best alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS EVALUATION</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTING DECISIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are new procedures needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are schedule changes required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are additional funds needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCT EVALUATION</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td><strong>RECYCLING DECISIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modify program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terminate program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In presenting this material clear lines of demarcation between staff and advisory council members were not advocated.
APPENDIX A4

1. STEPS GENERALLY FOLLOWED USING THE CIPP MODEL

EVALUATION DESIGN

- Delineation of information needs
  - Definition of system
  - Specification of decisions
- Plan for obtaining information
  - Statement of evaluation policies
  - Statement of evaluation assumptions
- Plan for providing information
  - Collection of data
  - Analysis of data
  - Organization of data
  - Dissemination of reports
  - Preparation of reports

APPENDIX A4

2. Delineation of Information Needs

EVALUATION DESIGN

DELINEATION OF INFORMATION NEEDS

* Define the System

What are the boundaries of the system?
What are the elements of the system?
What are the characteristics of the elements?

* Specify the Decisions to be Made

What is the purpose of the evaluation?
Who has decision authority?
Who has decision responsibility?
Who will influence decisions?
Who will receive information?
When must decisions be made?
What kinds of decisions are to be made?
What questions must be answered?
What decision rules will be used?

* State the Policies for the Evaluation

What data can be accessed?
Who can access this data?
Who will receive information?
What are the budgetary restrictions?
What are the schedule restrictions?
What are the resource restrictions?
What kinds of reports will be made?
Who will reports go to?
In what forms will reports be presented?

* State the Assumptions to be Made

What sampling assumptions will be made?
What treatment assumptions will be made?
What measurement assumptions will be made?
What analysis assumptions will be made?

*In presenting this material, primary attention was given to items at this level.
Appendix A4

3. Plan for Obtaining Information

EVALUATION DESIGN

PLAN FOR OBTAINING INFORMATION

* Collection of Data
  - What method of data collection will be used?
  - What will be the sample size?
  - What will the sampling procedures be?
  - What instruments will be used?
  - Are items related to information needs?
  - Who will be responsible for data collection?
  - What are the schedule restrictions?

* Organization of Data
  - How will the data be organized?
  - How will the data be stored?
  - How can the data be retrieved?
  - What error checks will be used?

* Analysis of Data
  - What unit of data will be analyzed?
  - What analysis methods will be used?
  - What analysis facilities will be used?


*In presenting this material, primary attention was given to items at this level.*
4. Plan for Providing Information

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

**PLAN FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION**

- **Preparation of Reports**
  - What are the audiences for the reports?
  - What levels of reports are needed?
  - Are interim reports required?
  - What will be the report setting?
  - What information will be reported?
  - What media are most appropriate?
  - What is the report schedule?

- **Dissemination of Reports**
  - How will reports be transmitted?
  - To whom should reports be disseminated initially?
  - Which reports will be disseminated to various audiences?
  - What procedures will be used to publish reports?


*In presenting this material, primary attention was given to items at this level.*
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS FROM WHICH PRIMARY NEEDS ARISE

1. **Intellectual development** -- development of the power or faculty of the mind by which one knows or understands, as distinguished from that by which one feels and that by which one wills; the faculty of thinking and acquiring knowledge.

2. **Emotional development** -- development of the capacity to deal effectively with feelings of joy, sorrow, fear, hate, or the like and development of a realistic and positive self concept.

3. **Physical development** -- development of motor coordination, body fitness, and hygiene and athletic abilities.

4. **Moral development** -- development of principles and habits with respect to right or wrong conduct, and acquiring the ability to conform to these principles rather than to custom, or even to law, when these are at variance with one's own moral convictions.

5. **Aesthetic development** -- developing a sense of, appreciation for, and ability to create beauty, especially as manifested in the areas of music, art, drama, and dance.

6. **Vocational development** -- developing a conception of the world of work and of one's career interests and aptitudes, and preparing to engage in gainful and fulfilling employment.

7. **Social development** -- developing the capacity and habit of living in friendly companionship with others in family and community settings, and developing and implementing a sense of responsibility for promoting and sustaining civilization.

APPENDIX A6

1. Steps in the Needs Assessment Process

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DESIGN

Preparation
- Describe the System
- State Information Needs

Implementation
- Develop Design, Policies, and Management Plan
- Develop Instrument

Application
- Collect Data
- Analyze Data
- Evaluate the Needs Assessment

Develop Design, Policies, and Management Plan
- Develop Political Viability
- Collect Data
- Report Findings
- Apply Findings

APPENDIX A 6

2. Preparation of Needs Assessment

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DESIGN

PREPARATION

Describe System

State Information Needs

Develop Political Viability

Develop Design, Policies, and Management Plan

What are the system boundaries, elements and characteristics?

What are the clients' and audiences' questions?

Which key personnel should be involved?

What procedures will be used (e.g., surveys, interviews)?

What definition of need and needs assessment will be used?

What information is needed to answer these questions?

How will the assessment be publicized?

How will the assessment be evaluated?

What is the population for the assessment?

What primary needs should be assessed?

What protocol should be followed?

What schedule will be adopted?

What secondary needs should be assessed?

What decision making procedure will be followed?

What support will be needed (e.g., personnel, facilities, finances)?

Whose judgments about the importance of needs will be sought?

Who will be responsible for various assessment activities?

What reporting procedures will be adopted?

Who will have editorial and dissemination authority?

Appendix A6

3. Implementation of Needs Assessment

NEEDS ASSESSMENT DESIGN

- Develop Instruments
  - What are the previously established information needs?
  - Which are the previously established primary and secondary needs to be assessed?
  - What information sources are available?
  - What kind of instruments (according to adopted procedures) are to be used?
  - What validating procedures will be used?

- Collect Data
  - What sampling procedures will be used?

- Analyze Data
  - What analysis techniques can be used to meet information needs?
  - What evidence can be found to support or refute identified questions?
  - What conclusions can be drawn?
  - What additional information was obtained?
  - What positive side effects are present?
  - What negative side effects are present?

- Report Findings
  - What reporting levels are to be used?
  - What information will be reported?
  - How will information be reported?
  - To whom will information be reported?

4. Plan for Providing Information

**Preparation of Reports**
- What are the audiences for the reports?
- What levels of reports are needed?
- Are interim reports required?
- What will be the report setting?
- What information will be reported?
- What media are most appropriate?
- What is the report schedule?

**Dissemination of Reports**
- How will reports be transmitted?
- To whom should reports be disseminated initially?
- Which reports will be disseminated to various audiences?
- What procedures will be used to publish reports?


*In presenting this material, primary attention was given to items at this level.*
NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION CYCLE

FOOTNOTES


2Ibid.


7Stake, R. E. The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 1967, 68, 523-540.


9Stufflebeam, et. al., op. cit.
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Presented to the
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and Advisory Council Members
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January 10, 1978
INTRODUCTION

During this session I would like to briefly review the needs assessment in evaluation seminar and to introduce the pre-needs assessment strategy that I have developed. Throughout the session you will be involved in small group work to formulate recommendations to the whole seminar group for decision making purposes. Your director and I have discussed small group and total seminar decision making procedures. We discerned two constraints that are applicable with respect to these procedures.

First, your task in small groups will be to make recommendations to the total seminar group. You should not, therefore, become overzealous in your committal to the recommendations you make; compromise may be necessary to achieve consensus of opinion and to facilitate total seminar group decision making.

Second, you should realize that in a school district such as Lakewood, the School Board and the Superintendent are ultimately responsible for the consequences of decisions made. It is reasonable to expect, therefore, that the power of veto rests with these people when decisions made conflict with district policies. This does not imply that district policies are beyond challenge. On the contrary, your challenges should be construed by the School Board and the Superintendent to be cooperative endeavors to improve the delivery of education to your community as a whole.
Summary of Needs Assessment in Evaluation Seminar

During the previous session it was established that:

1. Evaluation is a process by which the worth or merit of an object is systematically determined.

2. The process consists of three basic steps:
   - determining information needs;
   - obtaining the information; and,
   - providing the information for decision making purposes.

3. Each basic step encompasses a series of sub-steps which provide a guide to the common sense questions that would be asked when planning and implementing an evaluation.

4. Taken overall, evaluation can be construed to be an immense and complex process. This perception can be avoided by breaking the process down into steps and sub-steps, and working through these systematically and sequentially.

5. If evaluation is thus viewed, community educators (staff and advisory council alike) can become involved in the process.

6. Involvement of this nature necessarily implies joint decision making in:
   - establishing broad goals (context evaluation);
   - generating program alternatives to meet the broad goals and deciding which alternatives to implement (input evaluation);
   - making administrative changes to implement the program (process evaluation); and,
   - determining the worth or merit of the resulting program (product evaluation).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
7. As a general guide, advisory council members are relatively more involved in context and product evaluation, and staff in input and process evaluation. Absolute lines of demarcation are not intended, nor are they considered to be desirable.

8. A need is something that can be shown to be necessary or useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose.

9. Needs assessment is the process of determining what things are needed to serve some worthy purpose.

10. As such, needs assessment is an integral component of the total evaluation process at the context level.

11. Primary needs are those which derive from the intellectual, emotional, physical, moral, aesthetic, vocational, and social growth and development of individuals, groups, and the community at large. Secondary needs such as the availability of facilities, funds, and personnel are those which are derived from and contribute to fulfilling primary needs.

12. Needs assessment is a process consisting of three basic steps: preparation, implementation, and application.

13. Each basic step encompasses a series of sub-steps which provide a guide to the common sense questions that should be asked when planning and implementing a needs assessment.

14. Evaluation, which includes needs assessment, is a cyclical, developmental process aimed at program development and improvement.

The Entry Point Dilemma

As is the case with all cyclical processes it is difficult to
determine an entry point in evaluation. You have, however, already made two important decisions which will be of assistance in resolving the entry point problem. First you decided to evaluate your program, and second you decided to conduct a community needs assessment. In other words, you have decided that the initial purpose of your evaluation work is to establish broad goals relating to community needs. You will now be confronted with numerous crucial and difficult entry point questions. What kinds of community needs should be assessed, recreational, vocational, intellectual, or others? What is the possible range of needs which could be assessed? What group(s) of people will constitute the community in the needs assessment? Will the needs of the whole community be assessed or will specific groups of the community be singled out? What agencies other than Lakewood Community Education are currently providing programs to meet community needs? Does your present program duplicate the efforts of these agencies? If so, is such duplication warranted? Which community needs are being poorly or insufficiently met by existing programs? Do community needs exist that are completely unmet by existing programs? When establishing broad goals what priority should be accorded to unmet and poorly or insufficiently met community needs?

The Development of the Pre-needs Assessment Strategy

The pre-needs assessment strategy was developed as an evaluation methodology to enable community educators to systematically and sequentially approach entry point questions such as those delineated above. I have already pointed out that field based community educators seek
assistance from the Community Education Development Center at Western
Michigan University in the general field of evaluation more so than
in any other component part of the community education process. More­
over, I have observed that the majority of practitioner requests
for assistance with the evaluation process relate to entry point
questions, particularly in regard to community needs assessment.

The situation is not surprising if the complexity of the
community needs assessment process is taken into consideration. In­
deed, the feasibility of assessing all of the needs of an entire
community is most questionable. Tucker\(^1\) recently claimed that "the
assessment of community needs is difficult if not impossible to
totally derive." Is it possible to assess all of the needs of the
entire Lakewood community? Such an endeavor would be a mammoth task
if it were at all possible. What about all of the educational needs of
the entire Lakewood community? Once again the task would be immense
if at all feasible. How would you conceptualize the total educational
needs of your community? These, and the entry point questions already
outlined, prompted the development of the pre-needs assessment strategy.

The first step undertaken in developing the strategy was to adopt
a categorization of primary community needs. During the previous
session we examined Stufflebeam's\(^2\) growth and development areas from
which primary needs derive. This breakdown of needs was arbitrarily
chosen from similar categorizations such as those developed by
Havighurst\(^3\) in 1948 and others before him, through to Boles\(^4\) in 1973
and, of course, Stufflebeam in 1977. The Stufflebeam categorization
was chosen for its simplicity and because, in my opinion, it best
suits the special circumstances which apply in community education.
You will be required at a later stage to adapt or adopt the categorization selected according to your perception of its applicability to community education and to the Lakewood community.

The categorization of primary needs thus adopted completed only one half of the breakdown required. Community needs assessment involves "community" as well as "needs." Consequently, a breakdown or a categorization of the community into sub-groups was sought. My attempts to uncover a universally acceptable or generalizable categorization of this nature proved fruitless, however, mainly because communities differ one from the other. As a consequence I decided against advocating a particular categorization of community sub-groups, and to incorporate this task as a step in implementing the strategy. This decision created the fringe benefit of involving you in studying your community and deciding upon the required categorization of sub-groups. Moreover, as members of the Lakewood community you are in the best position to undertake this task.

The categories of primary needs and community sub-groups thus delineated will be placed on the axes of a matrix as shown in Appendix B1. The Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix which should result will be a graphic depiction of the total potential areas from which primary needs can arise in your community. You will note that the matrix in Appendix B1 can be "read", with each cell representing a specific primary need area for a designated community sub-group.

Steps to Implement the Pre-Needs Assessment Strategy

The remaining steps in developing the pre-needs assessment strategy are subsumed in the steps which should be followed to
implement the strategy. These are attached for your convenience in Appendix B2 immediately following the sample matrix. As I explain each of the steps please interrupt if you require additional information.

Rationale for the Pre-Needs Assessment Strategy

The factors which I contend support the pre-needs assessment strategy have been listed in Appendix B3. I would like to briefly examine these with you now. The true test of the benefits claimed will be whether they become apparent to you during the implementation of the strategy.

Growth and Development Areas From Which Primary Needs Arise

The concepts of primary and secondary needs were discussed during the previous seminar. I asked you at the time to carefully consider the growth and development areas from which primary needs arise. Stufflebeam developed these for needs assessment purposes in the K-12 system. In a moment you will be working in small groups, charged with the task of adapting or adopting the primary need areas for community education. It is important for you to consider the following questions as you undertake this task.

1. Do the primary need areas apply to community education equally as well as they do to elementary and high school education?
2. Are the primary need areas all encompassing? This question could be reframed as the following challenge: Can you think of a human service program in your community which cannot be subsumed under one or more of the primary need areas listed?
3. How do you wish to interpret each of the primary need areas listed? You might consider, for example, a separate category for spiritual development, or you may choose to interpret moral development to encompass this. Similarly, recreational development may be listed separately or subsumed under one or more of the suggested categories.

I have listed the growth and development areas in Appendix A4 with examples of programs that I perceive to be applicable to each category. Please remember that these materials are presented as a guide; your small group discussions may lead to markedly different categorization and/or interpretation.

The following reminders and instructions should prove helpful as you work in small groups.

1. Form groups of five or six with a mixture of staff and advisory council members in each group.

2. Your Director and I have arranged for Reverend Fred Bultman, Mrs. Della Meade, and Mrs. Lois Dickinson to act as group leaders.

3. Elect a person to record the recommendations of your group.

4. Your task is to recommend growth and development areas from which primary needs arise in your community.

5. Your leaders will report your recommendations to the total seminar group.

6. The total seminar group will then decide which categorization of growth and development areas will be adopted.

7. You have 10 minutes to work on the task. I realize that this is very little time but believe you will succeed, if you
remain on task.

(Small group work ensued for 10 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

Community Sub-Groups

Now that you have identified the growth and development areas from which primary needs arise in your community these can be placed along the horizontal axis of the matrix. I ask now, that you turn your attention to the significant sub-groups which together constitute your community. You will note that I have identified sub-groups for a hypothetical community on the sample matrix in Appendix B1. I would like you to follow three steps in this process:

1. Brainstorm possible community sub-groups.
2. Meet in your small groups again to prepare recommendations regarding the categorization which should be adopted.
3. Decide, as a total seminar group, on the categorization to be adopted.

Your small group task will be to recommend the community sub-group categorization that you feel is most relevant to your community. Apart from this change, the small group reminders and instructions, including the 10 minute time allocation remain the same. (Small group work ensued for 10 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

You have now established a matrix base relevant to your community. It can be viewed as a broad conceptualization of the total potential areas of primary need in your community. At the same time, the matrix can be "read", thus breaking the total potential areas of primary need in your community down into specific areas of need for
identified community sub-groups.

Agency Identification

I have consulted with your director regarding the human service agencies which offer programs in your community. An extensive list already exists although it may not be exhaustive. I would like you to meet in small groups once again to brainstorm a list of agencies which presently offer programs in your community. These will be checked against the existing list as your leader reports to the total seminar group in 10 minutes, and additions will be made accordingly. (Small group work ensued for 10 minutes followed by revision of the agency list.)

Collection of Agency Information

You have now created an extensive list of the agencies that are active in your community. Information regarding the current programs of these agencies must now be collected and placed on the matrix. Your assistance is sought in this task. A cursory glance at the list is revealing. It can readily be seen that the task of collecting the information required would be an arduous and time consuming process for a single individual.

I suggest that the best means of allocating the agencies to those present who are willing to participate in the information gathering process, is to start with the volunteer system. You may well be involved in, or represent one or more of the agencies listed, and as such you are the obvious person to make these particular contacts. The residue of agencies will then be allocated to insure an even work
balance and to accord with the time you will be able to commit to the task.

Please direct your attention to Appendix B5, the form to be used in the program information gathering process. You will note that agencies will be allocated numbers and the programs offered by the agencies will be allocated letters. Program information will be placed on the matrix in this form. For example, 27 could represent Lakewood Community Education and A could represent your "Wheels for a Day" program. We will allocate numbers to the agencies you will be contacting in a moment. You will be responsible for allocating letters to the various programs of these agencies.

Please prepare two lists of the agencies you will be contacting and number them as follows. Starting on my right, the first person will use numbers 1 to 10, the next 11 to 20 and so on. When you have finished please give me one of your lists so that a master list can be prepared.

You will notice that the program information gathering form challenges you to suggest the matrix cell in which programs should be placed. Where, for example, do you think the "Wheels for a Day" program should be placed? In one respect your understanding of the strategy is being tested by this challenge.

Two further aids have been prepared to assist you when you make contact with various agencies. The first of these is a letter of introduction which authorizes you to act on behalf of Lakewood Community Education. The second is a pamphlet which includes a statement of purpose and a summary of the steps you are following in conducting the community needs assessment. Please collect an adequate
supply of the pamphlets for distribution to the agencies you are to contact.

To facilitate planning for the next seminar in two weeks I would like you to telephone or hand deliver the results of your program information gathering, including your suggestions regarding matrix placement of programs, to the Lakewood Community Education Office, telephone 374-8897. The staff will then collate the information and prepare the matrix in readiness for our next session.

Program Versus Process Orientation in Community Education

Before concluding tonight's seminar I would like to return to the claim I have made that the pre-needs assessment strategy can facilitate transition from program to process orientation in community education. The claims made in this section constitute an expansion of the final factor presented in the rationale for the cognitive organizer, and, as such, should be viewed as part of the rationale. In an attempt to provide additional clarity, however, I have purposely delayed my remarks on this issue to follow the introduction of the strategy and the steps which should be followed to implement it.

You will recall the definition of community education adopted in the first seminar. A wide variety of definitions of community education abound in the literature, but widespread agreement exists that community education is a process directed toward community betterment or development. I understand that your service to the community includes "Wheels for a Day" for retired or disabled citizens, and that you played a catalytic role in providing a band rotunda in your community. These
are fine examples of the process orientation which currently exists in Lakewood Community Education.

It must be pointed out, however, that not all community educators are oriented toward community development in this manner. Quite often a program might be implemented because it proved to be financially successful in a neighboring community, regardless of whether a need for the program existed, or whether community development will ensue.

I strongly believe that the pre-needs assessment strategy, the needs assessment process, and indeed, the evaluation process as a whole are potentially incremental in enhancing the process orientation which already exists in community education at Lakewood. In support of this assertion I would like to direct your attention to the following:

1. The strategy requires you to delineate areas of unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met primary needs in your community and to rank order these according to your perception of the importance of each area. Broad goal areas are thus generated for Lakewood Community Education, and program development should reflect rank ordered primary need areas accordingly. Hence, your programs should be oriented toward the process of meeting unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met primary community needs.

2. When you list a need area using the steps outlined above this does not necessarily imply that an assessment of the area must be conducted nor that program development will ensue. You might decide upon alternative actions such as referral to a relevant agency, or the formation of an ad hoc task force with broader representation from other agencies and the community
at large to conduct a full scale investigation. In other words programs need not automatically emanate from the broad goal or need areas you list.

3. You will be required to designate need areas to which your programs and the programs of other human service respond with unnecessary duplication, and to decide upon consequent action which should be taken. This can hardly be construed to be program orientation. Indeed, you will be involved in the process of coordinating programs to enhance overall service to the community for its betterment.

4. You will be using a definition of need which requires you to state the "defensible purposes" of your activities. This definition differs markedly from the democratic view of need which has been used traditionally in community education. Needs assessments conducted using the democratic definition of need have too often merely asked citizens to select programs from pre-established lists. It cannot be denied that some of the programs developed as a result of such assessments will service community needs, but needs are confused with preferences, and the relevance of the pre-established lists of programs to community needs quite often remains questionable. Using the "defensible purposes" definition you are forced to relate your activities to the process of community development.

I hasten to admit that you must consider programs which are capable of generating the funds necessary to implement the alternative actions generated through using the pre-needs assessment strategy. In a sense you are meeting a secondary need which is necessary to facilitate
your activities to meet primary needs. This does not imply, however, that you should develop fund raising programs regardless of primary community needs. Quite to the contrary, your transition toward process orientation will be enhanced incrementally with each "defensible purpose" relating to primary community needs that you can state for every program you develop.

Conclusion

One of the criteria by which the pre-needs assessment strategy will be judged is the time required to implement it. You are all busy people who are obviously interested in your program and the development of your community. If the strategy requires a time commitment from you spanning months during its implementation, it will be considered to have limited potential. Consequently, I seek your cooperation in a concerted endeavor during the next two weeks. If you experience difficulty when gathering program information please call Lakewood Community Education for advice. I would personally appreciate it if you would make a note of difficulties encountered and pass these on to me when we meet again in two weeks. This information will be invaluable when next the strategy is implemented.

I commend you once again for your interest and cooperation and trust that you will meet with success in your tasks during the next two weeks.
APPENDIX B1

Sample Community Primary Needs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Moral</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PRIMARY NEEDS AREAS (SUGGESTED)

Note: The need areas suggested are examples to aid you in developing meaningful sub-groups for the Lakewood community.
APPENDIX B2

STEPS IN IMPLEMENTING THE PRE-NEEDS
ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

1. State the purpose of the needs assessment.

2. Adopt or adapt the growth and development areas from which primary
   needs arise.

3. Identify the sub-groups which constitute your community. At this
   stage the Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix base is
   complete.

4. Identify all agencies other than Lakewood Community Education which
   offer programs in your community.

5. Gather information regarding the present programs of these
   agencies.

6. Place the present Lakewood Community Education programs where you
   think they best fit on the matrix.

7. Place the present programs of other agencies where you think they
   best fit on the matrix.

8. Identify the matrix cells where present programs are duplicated
   unnecessarily and decide consequent action to be taken.

9. Identify the matrix cells where primary needs remain unmet, poorly
   met, or insufficiently met by existing programs.

10. Rank order the primary need areas thus identified according to
    your judgment of their importance.

11. Decide what action should be taken with respect to each of
    these primary need areas, e.g., conduct assessments, convene ad hoc
    task groups, refer to relevant agencies.

127
12. Approximate the degree to which secondary needs are met and the amount of latitude available for program development.

13. Determine the cut off point for the primary needs assessment according to the limitations identified in #11 above.

14. Conduct an assessment in the primary needs areas thus delineated.
APPENDIX B3

RATIONALE FOR THE PRE-NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

The following factors are submitted in support of the pre-needs assessment strategy.

1. The strategy has been designed to encourage citizen participation in community needs assessments and, consequently, in the total evaluation process.

2. By using the strategy, community educators are required to consider needs beyond their own and those of their families, friends, social groups, age groups, etc., to the needs of other families, social groups, age groups, organizations, etc., and to the needs of the community as a whole.

3. The strategy requires the decision making process to be shared by advisory council members and community education staff.

4. The strategy provides an answer, in part, to the "lack of an evaluation entry point dilemma" faced by community educators.

5. A systematic approach to needs assessment entry point questions has been built into the steps suggested to implement the strategy.

6. The needs matrix provides a basis for conceptualizing the total potential areas of need in the community.

7. The needs matrix provides a means of breaking the total potential areas of need in the community into specific areas of need for identified sub-groups of the community.

8. The strategy enables community educators to identify the areas of need they wish to assess. As a consequence, the assessment
process can be geared to budgetary, personnel, facility, and other resource limitations.

9. The strategy enables community educators to collect and collate information regarding the programs offered by other community agencies. Using this information, community educators can avoid duplicating existing programs.

10. By using the strategy, community educators can avoid redundancy in needs assessment data collection—collecting data upon which no action can be taken because of resource limitations.

11. The strategy is not expensive to implement if community educators work voluntarily during the program information gathering process.

12. Similarly, the strategy requires relatively little time to implement if community educators, staff and advisory council alike, participate in the program information gathering process.

13. The strategy can facilitate the transition from program to process orientation in community education.
OPERATIONAL FORM OF THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS FROM WHICH PRIMARY NEEDS ARISE

1. **Intellectual development** -- development of the power or faculty of the mind by which one knows or understands, as distinguished from that by which one feels and that by which one wills; the faculty of thinking and acquiring knowledge.
   
   **Examples:** K-12 programs in reading, mathematics, spelling and the like, adult basic education programs, English as a second language, literacy programs.

2. **Emotional development** -- development of the capacity to deal effectively with feelings of joy, sorrow, fear, hate, or the like, and the development of a realistic and positive self concept.
   
   **Examples:** Individual counseling, group counseling, group therapy, kindergarten and elementary school self concept development programs, therapeutic handicrafts.

3. **Physical development** -- development of motor coordination, body fitness, and hygiene and athletic abilities.
   
   **Examples:** Fitness programs, golf clinics, little league, health education programs, pre-natal clinics, yoga.

4. **Moral development** -- development of principles and habits with respect to right or wrong conduct and acquiring the ability to conform to these principles rather than to custom or even to law when these are at variance with one's moral convictions.
   
   **Examples:** Demonstrations, civil rights programs, values clarification programs, civics programs, scouts, bible study.
5. **Aesthetic development** — developing a sense of, appreciation for, and ability to create beauty, especially as manifested in the areas of music, art, drama, and dance.

**Examples:** Art, music, drama, and dance programs.

6. **Vocational development** — developing a conception of the world of work and of one's career interests and aptitudes and preparing to engage in gainful and fulfilling employment.

**Examples:** Job search skills programs, carpentry, accountancy courses, management programs.

7. **Social development** — developing the capacity and habit of living in friendly companionship with others in family and community settings and developing and implementing a sense of responsibility for promoting and sustaining civilization.

**Examples:** Cross cultural programs, inter-agency cooperation, family programs, card evenings.
APPENDIX B5

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT JANUARY 1978

Agency Program Information

Name of Agency __________________________________________________________

Information Collected by ________________________________________________

Information provided by _________________________________________________

Agency number allocated _________________________________ Date: 1/ /78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Program</th>
<th>Letter Allocated</th>
<th>Participant Group</th>
<th>Suggested Matrix Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FOOTNOTES

1Tucker, K. D. A model for assessing community occupational needs through inter-governmental data analysis. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, August, 1974, i.


5Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. News and announcements for your information. *23, Flint, Michigan: Author, December, 1977, 2. The definition is as follows: Community education is the process which, as related primarily to learning, insures community involvement in identification of community needs, utilization of resources and sharing of power in decision-making, and affects, strengthens and enriches the quality of living of individuals and their community.
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TRAINING PACKAGE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE
PRE-NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY
TRAINING PACKAGE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE
PRE-NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

by
Craig Cameron
Community Education Development Center
College of Education
Western Michigan University

Presented to the
Lakewood Community Education Staff
and
Advisory Council Members

Lakewood High School
Lake Odessa, Michigan
January 24, 1978
INTRODUCTION

To provide an overall perspective of tonight's seminar I have prepared an agenda (Appendix C1) which I would like you to examine while I expand on each of the items listed. It is obvious that you are going to be fully occupied, often as members of the small groups in which you worked during our previous sessions. The decision making constraints which applied at our previous session remain the same: recommending in small groups for total seminar decision making, and ratification by the Superintendent and the School Board.

Summary of Needs Assessment in Evaluation Training Seminar

Would you kindly refer to Appendix C1 in which I have summarized the proceedings of our first seminar? I have also prepared a series of overhead projections which further summarize this information.

Summary of Pre-Needs Assessment Strategy Training Seminar

The pre-needs assessment strategy was developed as a methodology to assist community educators to systematize their approach to entry point questions in the needs assessment process. The strategy uses a matrix which enables you to:

1. Conceptualize the total potential areas of need in your community;
2. Break the total potential areas of need down into
specific areas of need for identified community sub-groups;
determine how well each area of need is being met by the current programs of Lakewood Community Education and all other agencies operating in your community;
decide where existing programs and services are duplicated unnecessarily;
decide where existing programs and services are poorly or insufficiently meeting needs;
list the areas where greatest unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met needs exist in your community; and,
rank order these areas of need.

The above list also represents most of the steps which will be undertaken during tonight's seminar. I have already mentioned that you will be required as a group to share in the decision making process as the seminar proceeds. This is in keeping with the philosophy underlying the strategy, one of involving citizens in evaluation and decision making.

Summary of Decisions Made to Date

You made several decisions regarding the pre-needs assessment strategy during the past seminar sessions. The first of these was to state the purpose of the community needs assessment—to establish broad goals for Lakewood Community Education. Second, you established a matrix base relevant to your community. This process involved revising and adopting the seven growth and development areas from which primary needs arise in your community, and identifying sub-
groups which together constitute your community. The matrix which resulted according to the decisions you made is attached as Appendix C3. Third, you generated a list of human service agencies and collected information regarding the current programs offered by these agencies in your community. The information thus collected has been placed on the matrix in coded form.

Examination, Revision, and Adoption of the Matrix
Allocation of Program Information

Your first task tonight is to check the matrix allocation of the program information you have collected. The staff who prepared the matrix may have changed the allocation you recommended when you collected the information. You should note that some programs appear more than once on the matrix to cater for obvious overlap. A fringe benefit should emanate from this task; you should become more familiar in general with the Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix. Before you break into your small groups I would like to warn against spending too much time on the placement of a particular program. Arbitrary decisions have had to be made, and dissention over trivial differences of opinion will be time consuming in a very major task. Materials have been provided which enable you to work from the coded information on the matrix back to the original information and vice versa. I have allocated 10 minutes for the task which, once again, is to list recommended reallocations of programs on the matrix. The total seminar group will decide what action should be taken with respect to your recommendations when all group leaders' reports have been heard. The total seminar group will then adopt the Lakewood Community Primary
Needs Matrix. (Small group work ensued for 10 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

**Duplicated Programs**

Now that you have revised and adopted the matrix I would like you to meet again in small groups to decide where unnecessary duplication of programs exists. It would be incorrect to assume that all duplication of programs is harmful. Perhaps, for example, needs are such that a single agency cannot meet them. Nevertheless, you may detect what you believe to be unnecessary duplication. You should also consider the action that should be taken in such cases. You might recommend further investigation, or notifying the agencies involved. It is obvious that you will not be able to thoroughly examine all of the matrix cells during the next 15 minutes. I suggest, therefore, that you select two or three cells to investigate thoroughly. When you have made your selections I shall check that you are not duplicating your efforts on this particular task. Once again, you will be listing matrix cells in which current programs are unnecessarily duplicated and recommending action that should be taken as a consequence. The total seminar group will meet again in 15 minutes to hear group reports and to decide consequent action. (Small group work ensued for 15 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

**Identification of Areas Where Unmet, Poorly Met or Insufficiently Met Primary Needs Exist**

You have now reached a critical step in implementing the pre-needs assessment strategy. Your small group task this time is to identify...
matrix cells in which primary needs remain unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met. The need areas thus identified will become the basic goal areas for Lakewood Community Education, and program development at a later stage should reflect these need areas accordingly. As you undertake your task please bear in mind the fact that the matrix cells do not represent equivalent areas of need. It would be unrealistic, for example, to equate the vocational needs of pre-school children with the intellectual needs of K-12 students.

You might question the wisdom of asking lay citizens to designate programs which "poorly" or "insufficiently" meet primary needs in the community. I contend, however, that you as members of this community are in the best position to make such judgments. It does not concern me that you will not be able to avoid subjectivity in making your judgments. Indeed, I am prepared to place a great deal of confidence in your judgments irrespective of this factor.

Please work in your small groups again, this time for 20 minutes. Your task is to list the matrix cells in which you believe primary needs remain unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met and recommend these to the total seminar group for decision making purposes. (Small group work ensued for 20 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

Primary and Secondary Needs

You have now established a comprehensive list of matrix cells in which you perceive greatest unmet, poorly met, or insufficiently met primary needs exist in your community. Moreover, each of the areas thus identified provides defensible purposes upon which program develop-
ment can be based. When I spoke about primary and secondary needs at the last seminar I pointed out that it would be idyllic, but unrealistic, to conduct an assessment of primary needs only, and to base program development "wholly and solely" on the findings of such an assessment. You will recall that secondary needs are those which derive from and contribute to primary needs. Another way of viewing the relationship between the two types of needs is to regard secondary needs as facilitators of primary needs.

The question, "To what extent will secondary needs allow program development in primary need areas?" is now relevant. The final four steps suggested to implement the pre-needs assessment strategy addresses this question. These are as follows:

1. You will be asked to work in small groups to rank order the primary needs areas you have listed according to the importance you attribute to each area.

2. Working once again in small groups, you will be asked to generate action alternatives and recommend the action alternatives which should be implemented with respect to each primary need area. An explanatory note is warranted at this stage. At first glance this step appears to be evaluation in the input realm rather than context. The "actions" referred to, however, are still pre-needs assessment alternatives. You should note that simply listing an area of need is not an automatic indication that an assessment should be conducted in that area. Perhaps the information required has already been collected by another agency. You might recommend that unmet needs in a certain area are so great that an ad hoc task force, with wider
representation from other agencies and the community at large, should be convened to conduct a full scale investigation. Conversely, your recommendation may be to assess needs in certain areas. I shall remind you of the need to remain task oriented when this step is reached.

3. Your director will report briefly on secondary needs to give you an indication of the amount of latitude available for program development in the primary need areas you recommend for assessment purposes.

4. You will then be in a position to list the areas of primary need which will be assessed.

Rank Ordering of Primary Need Areas

According to the steps I have delineated to complete the implementation of the pre-needs assessment strategy you are now required to work in your small groups to rank order the primary need areas that you have listed. Once again, you will be recommending to facilitate total seminar group decision making when all small group reports have been heard. I have allocated 10 minutes for this task. (Small group work ensued for 10 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

Action Alternatives and Recommendations About Each Rank Ordered Need Area

Your next small group task is to generate action alternatives about each need area and to recommend the alternative which should be implemented. I briefly mentioned some of the alternatives available to you moments ago when I warned you about remaining on task. You
will find it tempting to generate program alternatives with respect to each need area, but this is not your task at present. Generation of program alternatives is input evaluation rather than context evaluation. Undoubtedly, your suggestions regarding program alternatives will be sought at the input stage of the total evaluation process.

Your task once again, is to generate action alternatives pertaining to each need area such as convening ad hoc committees, referring to relevant agencies, and conducting needs assessments, and to recommend the action which should be implemented. The total seminar group will then decide the course of action to be adopted. I have allocated 15 minutes for this task. (Small group work ensued for 15 minutes followed by total seminar decision making.)

Director's Report on Secondary Needs

I spoke at some length at previous seminars and again tonight about the necessity of meeting secondary needs to facilitate program development in primary needs areas. Your Director has made a preliminary investigation of secondary needs to ascertain the extent to which program development in primary needs areas can be carried out. He has prepared a statement which he will now present for your information. (The Director's report ensued for 7 minutes.)

Delineation of Primary Need Areas to be Assessed

The final step in implementing the pre-needs assessment strategy is relatively simple. You have at your disposal a list of matrix cells in which you have decided to conduct assessments. Additionally, your Director has given you an indication of the constraints you must work
within. Your task, this time as a whole seminar group, is to determine a cut-off point for the needs assessment. You should be mindful of the fact that data collection is a costly process in terms of both time and money. Quite apart from the costs involved, your credibility as community educators is at stake if you collect data upon which you know you cannot take any action because of unmet secondary needs. (Total seminar decision making ensued for 12 minutes.)

Conclusion

You are now ready to put the assessment process into action in the areas you have delineated for this purpose. You have also decided upon action which should be taken with respect to matrix cells where programs are duplicated unnecessarily. Additionally, you have decided upon "action alternatives" other than needs assessment with respect to a third group of matrix cells.

In conclusion I would like you to consider two aspects of the evaluation process. First, I direct your attention to the entry point questions which confronted you at the outset. Do you now know what kinds of needs will be assessed? What is the possible range of needs which could be assessed? What community sub-groups' needs will be assessed? If you can answer these and the other entry point questions posed at the outset, then we have met with some degree of success in implementing the pre-needs assessment strategy.

Second, and most important, your involvement in the evaluation process should not cease at this stage. You have further decisions to make with respect to the needs assessment and to the evaluation process as a whole. You have a data collection instrument to prepare
and administer, a process in which your involvement is vital. You have input, process, and product evaluations to conduct and decisions to make with respect to the findings of each.

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation for the opportunity you have provided to implement the pre-needs assessment strategy and for your cooperation and enthusiasm during implementation. For dissertation purposes my involvement in the evaluation of your program is no longer necessary. I wish to assure you, however, of my continued support as we proceed through the total evaluation process.
APPENDIX C1

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
PRE-NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION SEMINAR
LAKEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL
JANUARY 24, 1978
7:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Summary of needs assessment in community education evaluation training seminar.
2. Summary of pre-needs assessment strategy training seminar.
3. Summary of decisions made to date.
4. Examine, revise where necessary, and adopt the allocation of programs to matrix cells.
5. Ascertain where present programs and services are duplicated unnecessarily and decide action to be taken.
6. Ascertain where present programs and services are poorly, insufficiently, or not meeting existing needs.
7. List the cells where greatest unmet needs exist.
8. Rank order the cells listed in 7 above according to the degree of need evident.
9. Decide what action should be taken with respect to each of these cells.
   (1) conduct needs assessment
   (2) convene ad hoc task groups
   (3) refer to relevant agencies
   (4) ______________________
10. Director’s report on secondary needs.
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11. List the cells in which the needs assessment will be conducted.

12. Provide reports of any difficulties encountered during the data gathering process.
During the needs assessment in community education evaluation session it was established that:

1. **Evaluation is a process by which the worth or merit of an object is systematically determined.**

2. The process consists of **three basic steps:**
   - determining information needs
   - obtaining the information
   - providing the information for decision making purposes

3. Each basic step encompasses a series of sub-steps which provide a guide to the common sense questions that should be asked when planning and implementing an evaluation.

4. Taken overall, evaluation can be construed to be an immense and complex process. This perception can be avoided by breaking the process down into steps and sub-steps, and working through these systematically and sequentially.

5. If evaluation is thus viewed, community educators (staff and advisory council alike) can become involved in the process.

6. Involvement of this nature necessarily implies joint decision making in:
   - establishing broad goals (**context evaluation**)
   - generating program alternatives to meet the broad goals and deciding which alternatives to implement (**input evaluation**)
--making administrative changes to implement the programs
(process evaluation)
--determining the worth or merit of resulting programs
(product evaluation)

7. As a general guide advisory council members are relatively
more involved in context and product evaluation, and staff
in input and process evaluation. Absolute lines of
demarcation are not intended, nor are they considered to be
desirable.

8. A need is something that can be shown to be necessary or
useful for the fulfillment of some defensible purpose.

9. Needs assessment is the process of determining what things
are needed to serve some worthy purpose.

10. As such, needs assessment is an integral component of the total
evaluation process at the context level.

11. Primary needs are those which derive from the intellectual,
emotional, physical, moral, aesthetic, vocational, and social
growth and development of individuals, groups, and the community
at large. Secondary needs such as the availability of facilities,
funds, and personnel are those which are derived from and
contribute to fulfilling primary needs.

12. Needs assessment is a process consisting of three basic
steps, preparation, implementation, and application.

13. Each basic step encompasses a series of sub-steps which provide
a guide to the common sense questions that should be asked
when planning and implementing a needs assessment.

14. Evaluation, which includes needs assessment, is a cyclical,
developmental process aimed at program development and improvement.
# APPENDIX C3

Lakewood Community Primary Needs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS OF PRIMARY NEED</th>
<th>Community Sub-Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Retired Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Home-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Pre-school Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN EVALUATION TRAINING SEMINAR
PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT
APPENDIX D

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN EVALUATION TRAINING SEMINAR
LAKEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL
JANUARY 10, 1978

Participant Feedback Instrument

Please respond to the following using a scale of
5 = strongly agree (SA)
4 = agree (A)
3 = uncertain (U)
2 = disagree (D)
1 = strongly disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what evaluation was.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what evaluation is.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in the evaluation process.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what a need was.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what a need is.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of what needs assessment was.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of what needs assessment is.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the difference between primary and secondary needs.  
5 4 3 2 1

9. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps normally followed in conducting a needs assessment.  
5 4 3 2 1

10. Prior to tonight's seminar I had a good general understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.  
5 4 3 2 1

11. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the relationship between needs assessment and evaluation.  
5 4 3 2 1

12. I found the trainer's presentation to be helpful.  
5 4 3 2 1

13. I found the printed handouts to be helpful.  
5 4 3 2 1

14. I found the overhead transparencies to be helpful.  
5 4 3 2 1

15. The next time the needs assessment in evaluation training seminar is conducted I recommend that ____________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation and response.
Participant Feedback Instrument

Please respond to the following using a scale of
5 = strongly agree (SA)
4 = agree (A)
3 = uncertain (U)
2 = disagree (D)
1 = strongly disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prior to tonight's seminar I felt confident enough to participate in a community needs assessment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As a result of the seminar I feel confident enough to participate in a community needs assessment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As a result of the seminar I have a good general understanding of the steps which must be followed to implement the pre-needs assessment strategy.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I found the identification of areas of primary need to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I found the identification of subgroups which constitute my community to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I found the identification of other agencies in my community to be a fairly simple process.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I believe that I shall be able to obtain the information required from the agencies allocated to me in the required time. 5 4 3 2 1

8. I found the trainer's presentation to be helpful. 5 4 3 2 1

9. I found the printed handouts to be helpful. 5 4 3 2 1

10. I found the overhead transparencies to be helpful. 5 4 3 2 1

11. The next time the pre-needs assessment strategy training seminar is conducted I recommend that ____________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

Thank you for your participation and response.
APPENDIX F

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
PRE-NEEDS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION SEMINAR
LAKEWOOD HIGH SCHOOL
JANUARY 24, 1978

Participant Feedback Instrument

Please respond to the following using a scale of
5 = strongly agree (SA)
4 = agree (A)
3 = uncertain (U)
2 = disagree (D)
1 = strongly disagree (SD)

1. I was able to collect the information from the agencies allocated to me in the required time without difficulty 5 4 3 2 1

2. If you experienced difficulty or you were not able to complete your task please provide a brief explanation.

3. I found the letter of introduction to be helpful. 5 4 3 2 1

4. I found the printed booklet to be helpful. 5 4 3 2 1

5. I found the process of placing the programs of agencies (other than Lakewood Community Education) on the matrix to be fairly simple. 5 4 3 2 1
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6. If you experienced difficulty with this process please provide a brief explanation.

7. I found the matrix to be valuable in helping me to organize in my mind, the total potential areas of need in my community. 5 4 3 2 1

8. I found the process of determining where programs are duplicated unnecessarily to be fairly simple. 5 4 3 2 1

9. If you experienced difficulty with this process please provide a brief explanation.

10. I found the process of determining where needs are being poorly or insufficiently met by existing programs to be fairly simple. 5 4 3 2 1

11. If you experienced difficulty with this process please provide a brief explanation.

12. I found the process of rank ordering the cells of the matrix in which greatest need exists to be fairly simple. 5 4 3 2 1
13. If you experienced difficulty with this process please provide a brief explanation.


SA A U D SD

14. I found the process of making decisions regarding the action we should take with respect to the ordered cells to be fairly simple. 5 4 3 2 1

15. If you experienced difficulty with this process please provide a brief explanation.


SA A U D SD

16. I feel confident that I can participate further in conducting the community needs assessment. 5 4 3 2 1

17. I feel confident that I can participate further in the evaluation of our community education program. 5 4 3 2 1

18. The next time the pre-needs assessment strategy is implemented I recommend that _____________________________________________________


Thank you for your participation and response.
APPENDIX G

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
FOR
COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
January 10, 1978

This letter serves to introduce the bearer ____________________________ WHO HAS BEEN AUTHORIZED BY Lakewood Community Education to assist in the information gathering process of a community needs assessment we are currently conducting with assistance from the Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center. Should you require additional verification of the bearer's credentials, please call Lakewood Community Education at 374-8897.

Our aim in conducting the assessment is to collect information which will enable us to develop programs and services reflecting community needs. Additionally, the information will enable us to avoid duplicating the existing programs and services of other agencies in our community.

We seek your cooperation in this endeavor and extend our sincere appreciation for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Alma Grinage, President
Lakewood Community Education Advisory Council

Daryl Hartzler, Director
Lakewood Community Education

Craig Cameron, Project Advisor
Western Michigan University
Community Education Development Center

Helping the community to become the best it is capable of becoming
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APPENDIX H

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT PAMPHLET

The following is the text of an eight page pamphlet prepared for distribution to the Lakewood citizens who provided agency program information and to those who, at a later stage, responded to the community needs assessment.
LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION
COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
JANUARY 1978

The above pamphlet appeared in 5 1/2 x 8 1/2 pamphlet form.
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UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Lakewood Community Education
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Introduction

At a Lakewood Community Education Advisory Council Meeting on December 13, 1977 a decision was made to conduct a community needs assessment. The purpose of the assessment is to collect information which will enable us to develop programs and services reflecting community needs. Additionally, the information collected will enable us to avoid developing new programs or services which duplicate those already being offered by other agencies in our community.

Citizen Involvement

We strongly believe that citizen involvement in education is only possible if the responsibility for making decisions is shared between educators and the community through its elected representatives. The needs assessment planned will provide community representatives (the Lakewood Community Education Advisory Council) with information necessary for them to share in the decision making process. We believe that the needs assessment and citizen participation in decision making will result in programs and services which will best meet our community's needs.
Evaluation

In recent years evaluation has become an extremely important process in education. To the lay person, however, it is often an extremely vague term denoting a complicated process. We are challenging this view by taking part in the process of evaluating the programs and services offered by Lakewood Community Education. Apart from helping us to make decisions about our programs and services, the needs assessment will also enable us to establish our broad goals and provide a basis for our evaluation throughout the forthcoming year.

The Needs Assessment

With guidance from Western Michigan University Community Education Development Center we have decided on the following steps to conduct the community needs assessment.

1. Identify the total possible areas from which needs can arise in our community.
2. Identify the significant groups which make up our community.
3. Place these along the axes of a matrix (as shown below) to form the Lakewood Community Needs Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retired Citizens</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Homemakers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Pre-school Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Place the present Lakewood Community Education programs and services on the matrix.

5. Collect information about the present programs and services of all other agencies in our community and place these on the matrix.

6. Decide where present programs do not meet, poorly meet, or insufficiently meet existing community needs.
7. Conduct the community needs assessment in these areas.

8. Decide on the programs and services that should be developed according to the results of the needs assessment.

9. Implement and evaluate the programs and services.

**The Future**

We are relying on the community needs assessment to assist us in developing programs and services which reflect community needs. Our evaluation will provide us with information regarding the extent to which the programs and services developed succeed or fail to meet community needs. Future needs assessments will take this information into account. In this manner, a cycle of needs assessment, program and services development, evaluation, needs assessment, program and service development --- etc., will be established.
The Present

We seek your cooperation in providing the information we require in our community needs assessment. You may be contacted in your capacity as an agency administrator, service club office holder, or similar leadership position. At a later stage, we may request your cooperation once again as we implement the community needs assessment.

Needless to say, we sincerely appreciate your cooperation and assistance in this endeavor.

Alma Grinage, President
Lakewood Community Education
Advisory Council

Daryl Hartzler, Director
Lakewood Community Education

Craig Cameron, Project Advisor
Western Michigan University
Community Education Development Center
APPENDIX I

REMINDER LETTER
January 16, 1978

A week has passed now since the needs assessment in evaluation seminar at which we discussed the needs assessment you plan to conduct in your community. I trust that you are making good progress in collecting the information required from the agencies allocated to you. Needless to say, your assistance in this venture is sincerely appreciated, and I hope that you are not finding the task too arduous.

I would like to remind you about our next meeting to be held at Lakewood High School on January 24, 1978 at 7:00 p.m. Additionally, I would like to remind you to note any difficulties you encounter during the information collection process. This information will be invaluable when next the pre-needs assessment strategy is implemented.

I look forward to working with you again on January 24th.

Yours sincerely,

Craig Cameron
Project Advisor
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