

Index

A

Aaron, H., 116
Accountability, 107, 111
AERA, 22
American Evaluation Assoc., 107, 133
Application of Advanced Technology (AAT)
Program
description, 3, 45;
evaluation criteria, 32-35;
funding level, 26;
goals, 27, 47;
“high risk” portfolio, 28, 45;
nature of, 140;
program pay-offs, 32, 137;
proof of concept, 32
Assessment
of learning, 18;
of needs, 43, 91;
of program progress, 28
Auletta, K., 121

B

Ball, D.L., 111
Barley, Z.A., 103, 105
Barley, Z.A., & Jenness, M., 77, 127, 129
Barnouw, E., 110, 112
Bell, T., 113
Bellavita, C., Wholey, J.S., & Abramson,
M.A., 99
Booz, Allen, & Hamilton, 121
Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D., 59
Boring, E.G., 118
Boruch, R., 41
Bruner, 41
Bureau of Labor Statistics, 13

C

Carpenter, T.P., & Moser, T.M., 60
Carroll, J.B., 61
Chelimsky, E., 110, 120, 131, 133
Cluster analysis. *See* evaluation methodology

Coles, R., 111
Collaboration
across agencies, 12;
across projects, 21
Cook, T.D., 120
Cronbach, L.J., 99, 105, 107, 108, 110, 115,
119, 120, 122

D

Data. *See also* evaluation methodology;
impact measures
acknowledgment of source, 9;
bounding collection of, 79, 88, 93, 145;
case histories as collection strategy, 85;
in cluster analysis, 103;
collection of, 46, 89, 152;
enhancing use of, 12;
by museums, 91;
qualitative, 43, 50, 93-94, 119;
quantitative, 1, 26, 43, 50, 93-94;
sharing by government agencies, 12;
tracking use of, 7-8
Denzin, N.K., 117
Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y., 112, 116
Department of Education
Eisenhower program, 20, 37, 76, 77;
evaluation activities, 37;
National Center for Education Statistics
(NCES), 7, 10, 13;
National Diffusion Network, 76, 77, 79,
94;
OERI, 76;
Planning and Evaluation Service, 7
Dissemination
of AAT project outcomes, 45, 46;
audience for, 94;
in cluster evaluation, 105;
and data use, 12;
evaluation of, 48, 75-76;
and footprints, 82, 148, 153;
need for, 45, 93, 97, 127-128, 131-132;

(Dissemination *continued*)
role of intermediaries, 79
Donmoyer, R., 99

E

Eisenhower program. *See* Department of Education
Eisner, E., 115
Erickson, F., 116
Evaluation. *See also* assessment; evaluation methodology
and accountability, 54, 107, 111;
and advocacy, 98, 107;
audiences, 49, 53, 93, 127, 143-144;
cost/budget considerations, 54, 109, 144;
of dissemination, 48;
and educational practice, 19, 54, 98;
intergovernmental cooperation, 37-38;
need for explanation and understanding, 114, 132;
and policy, 12, 18, 33, 108;
and politics, 110-111, 128;
program and project, 2, 27, 43, 97, 140;
purpose of, 97-98, 110, 132;
questions, 19-21, 31, 39, 48, 50-52, 62-66, 77-78, 100-101, 115-116, 127;
relation to activities not funded by NSF, 32, 35, 40, 41, 146-147;
requirements for small grants, 129;
theory, 132
Evaluation methodology. *See also* data;
evaluation; impact measures; validation
application matrix, 62-63;
audit model, 121;
causal inference, 1, 29, 31, 108, 110, 134, 148, 152;
expert panel, 28, 137-138;
formal vs informal, 108;
generalizability analysis, 55, 71-72, 73, 95, 151;
goal based vs goal free, 47, 48, 52;
meta-analysis, 136-137;
non-traditional, 1, 2, 22-23, 112, 114, 149-150;
based on interpretation, 115-116, 119-122;
cluster analysis, 77, 89, 97, 101-106, 127, 129, 135, 151-152;

(Evaluation methodology, nontraditional *continued*)
constructivist, 48, 114, 117;
empowerment, 135;
naturalistic, 47, 50, 114;
subjectivist, 47;
partial comparisons, 29-32, 146, 150-151, 153;
and program goals, 141;
product vs process, 110, 114;
qualitative vs quantitative, 50, 112, 119, 127, 128, 133, 149-150;
research community culture analysis, 54, 70-71, 73, 95;
retrograde analysis, 54, 66-67, 95;
retrospective vs prospective, 46;
sampling, 72, 95, 146;
standard model, 135, 144;
statistically significant differences, 136;
traditional, 1, 15, 25-26, 98, 115, 133, 140;
triangulation, 117;
use of multiple methods, 61, 108, 128;
use of social problem study group, 99, 120;
video documentary, 54, 67-70, 73, 95
Evaluation Network, 134

F

Fennema & Carpenter, 57
Fitzsimmons, S.J., 35
Footprints
absence of, 16, 20, 146;
archive, 146;
critique of concept, 108-109;
definition, 1-2, 7, 142;
and dissemination, 48, 82;
and educational reform, 78;
as evaluation tool, 79, 142;
of Indicator and Studies programs, 7;
origin of metaphor, 3;
rationale, 15;
of RTL program, 19, 21, 22;
sources of, 8-11, 50, 82, 142, 145, 153

G

Geertz, C., 116
General Accounting Office (GAO),
8-9, 13, 29, 120
Gordon, S.W., and Bhattachanyya, 17

Grant process
and documentation of research use, 10;
and evaluation methods, 25, 27-28, 141;
grantees' agendas, 25, 28, 41;
need for documentation of activities, 41;
philosophy, 27-28, 141

Guba, E.B., 77, 88

Guba, E.B., & Lincoln, Y.,
99, 100, 108, 114, 115

Guiton, S., & Burstein, I., 109

H

Hattie, J., 136, 138

House, E.R., 49

I

Impact measures

and advocacy, 107;
conceptualization, 32;
direct vs indirect, 109;
in evaluation models, 26, 33-34, 127, 135;
indicators, 2, 49;
methodological innovations, 11;
new ideas as, 32;
obstacles in NSF programs, 26, 28;
and political pressure, 107;
qualitative vs quantitative, 52, 93;
in relation to goals, 47;
sources of information, 48;
unanticipated outcomes, 47, 48;
validity of, 109, 111-112

Implementation 75, 80

Indicators Program

assessing data use, 7-13;
description, 3, 7;
footprints, 7-11;
and policy making process, 13;
program goals, 32

Informal science education, 91

and use of NSF research products, 92

Intermediary organizations, 41

description, 76;
and implementation, 75;
and knowledge transfer, 9, 77, 78, 79;
museums as, 91;
and program evaluation, 77, 94, 153;
role in education reform, 76, 147-148;
selection of, 88, 94

International Mathematics Study

second, 11, 58, 68;

third, 7

Interpretation council, 120-121, 127, 137;
and External Expert Panel, 120

K

Kaplan, A., 60

Katzenmeyer, C., 119, 120

Kellogg Foundation, 101

Kelly, M., 111

Knowledge utilization, 12, 80

Krueger, M., 112

L

Levin, 136

Louis, K.S., 79

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E.S., 105

Lindblom, C.E. & Cohen, D.K., 122

M

McGrath, J.L., 32

McLaughlin, M., 80

McLuhan, M., 67, 113

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, M.A., 119

Mosteller, F., 136, 138

N

National Center for Education Statistics
(NCES). *See* Department of Education

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
(NCTM), 22, 57, 60, 86, 111

National Diffusion Network (NDN).

See Department of Education

National Research and Education Network
(NREN), 9

National Science Foundation (NSF), 8, 9, 13,
15, 21, 27, 28, 77, 78, 133

Nelson, C.E., 80

O

Office of Inspector General (OIG), 133, 137

Outcome measures. *See* impact measures

P

Peer review, 1, 122

and project funding, 95, 137;

and use of information, 10

Piaget, J., 60
Pilot testing of innovative methodologies, 153
Polanyi, M., 113
Porter, A.C., 110
Psocka, J., 113
Principal Investigator (PI)
 as source of information, 10, 48;
 career as outcome indicator, 95
Project evaluation. *See* evaluation

R

Reform in mathematics and science
 education, 18, 59, 78, 81, 83
Research in education
 basic vs applied, 59;
 and educational practice, 61;
 importance of theories and models, 60-61;
 and museums, 91;
 relation between research and evaluation,
 132;
 science and math, 61, 130;
 typology, 59;
 “uses of,” 7
Research in Teaching and Learning Panel,
 15, 21
Research in Teaching and Learning Program
 (RTL)
 and cluster analysis, 98;
 evaluation questions, 19-21, 62-66, 77-78,
 94, 132, 134;
 footprints, 19, 21-22;
 goals, 18-19, 40, 55-56;
 nature of, 95, 140;
 program description, 3, 17-18, 55, 57-58;
 use of generalizability analysis, 95
RMC Research Corp., 81
Rockefeller Foundation, 7, 12
Rossi, P., 41

S

Schwandt, T., 114, 117
Shavelson, R.J., 109
Scriven M., 47, 107, 109, 110, 115, 122
Smith, N.L., 77, 88, 134
Spiro, R.J., 112
Stake, R.E., 115, 118, 127, 129, 130, 132,
 133, 136, 137
Stake, R.E. and Trumbull, D., 113, 116

Stakeholder, 49-50;
 as clients, 49;
 and program effects, 48;
 role in evaluation, 2, 82, 97, 99;
 as sources of information, 47
Stevenson, H., 58, 72
Strauss, A. and Corbin, J., 120
Studies Program
 assessing data use, 7-13;
 definition, 3, 7;
 footprints, 7-11;
 funding level, 26;
 goals of, 26, 32;
 nature of, 140;
 and policy making process, 13

T

Technical Assistance Centers (TAC)
 76, 77, 85-88
Technical assistance agencies, 79
Trumbull D., 114

U

Underrepresented groups
 empowerment for, 56;
 program goals and impacts for, 18, 20;
 recruitment for professional activities, 20

V □

Validation. *See also* evaluation methodology
 contradictory results, 54;
 of effectiveness indicators, 111, 113;
 of observations, 117;
 of program goals, 47;
 of traditional evaluation methods, 128
Van de Vall, M., 80
Von Wright, G.H., 114
Von Maanan, J., 117

W

Webb, N.L., 89, 91, 95
Webb, N.L. Schoen, H. and Whithurst, S.D.,
 67
Weick, K., 89
Weiss, C., 79
Wholey, J.S., 98
Wholey, J.S. and White, B.F., 98
Wittgenstein, 132

Worthen, B.L. and Sanders, J.R., 46
Woolley, B., 112

Y

Yin, R.K., 29, 89, 119
Yin, R.K. and Sivilli, T.S., 29

Z

Zacharias, 41

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
ARLINGTON, VA 22230

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

RETURN THIS COVER SHEET TO ROOM P35 IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO RECEIVE THIS MATERIAL □, OR IF CHANGE OF ADDRESS IS NEEDED □, INDICATE CHANGE INCLUDING ZIP CODE ON THE LABEL (DO NOT REMOVE LABEL).

**SPECIAL FOURTH-CLASS RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
National Science Foundation
Permit No. G-69**