A Needs Assessment in the Conduct of Program Evaluation in Schools

Carlo Magno
*De La Salle University,
Manila, Philippines*

The present report surveyed selected schools in one province in the Philippines to determine their needs in evaluation and how evaluation is currently being practiced. Very few schools engage in the real concept of evaluation, which brought the attention to assess the practices and needs of schools in the area of evaluation. There is a need to study how schools undertake their evaluation of programs in order to identify the problems encountered by schools and to target specific ways to improve them. Based on the results, the needs of the schools include: (1) to improve teacher performance and teacher training evaluation, (2) to consider alternative ways of evaluation such as focus group discussions and surveys, (3) training on instrumentation as a technical skill, (4) seminars and workshops that provide venues for learning about the process of evaluation, (5) improve the personnel, practice, relational, and study aspects of evaluation in schools.

Keywords: Needs Assessment, Needs of Schools, Program Evaluation

S chools offer different programs to enhance the teaching and the learning process. One way to determine whether certain educational programs needs to be improved or is effective is through proper evaluation. The information generated through proper evaluation is important since it can aid practitioners in the ministry or department of education for undertaking various decisions and plans to make improvements and decisions regarding educational programs. Although very few schools engage in the real concept of evaluation. This claim is justified by assessing the practices and needs of schools in line with proper evaluation. Personnel involved in running educational programs

Personnel involved in running educational programs have different viewpoints and misconceptions of program evaluation. According to Fitzpatrick, Worthen, and Sanders (2004) some authors opt for a systems approach, while others view evaluation as a process of identifying and collecting information to assist decision makers. Others view evaluation as synonymous with professional judgment, where judgment of a program's quality is based on opinion of experts. In one school of thought, evaluation is viewed as the process of comparing performance data with clearly specified objectives, while in another evaluation is seen as synonymous with carefully controlled experimental research on programs. Others urge the importance of naturalistic inquiry or urge that value pluralism be recognized where the individuals evaluated play a prime role in determining what direction the evaluation study takes. These various points of view on evaluation bring about differences in opinion on how evaluation is suppose to be done but the worst are misconceptions on handling evaluations. Even if there are various ways in the conduct of evaluation, a key result area that needs to be obtained is the end goal of evaluation, which is to come up with a judgment and an overall value of a program and its relative value. The American Evaluation Association made effort to generate the "Guiding Principles for Evaluation" to properly guide evaluators. These guide entails (a) that inquiries should be data-based whatever is evaluated, (b) evaluators needs to be competent, (c) honesty and integrity is needed in the process, (d) respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of the respondent, and (e) the articulation of responsibilities for the general and public welfare. Schools conducting the process of evaluation must be aware of these guiding principles needs to be placed into proper perspectives.

There is a need to study how schools undertake their evaluation and their needs in order to assess the problems faced by schools and to generate specific ways to improve them especially in provincial areas of the Philippines where students achievement are low. There is also a need to investigate how the practice of evaluation is being conducted in the provincial area to see how evaluation is conceptualized in different contexts. This report surveyed selected schools in the one provincial area in the Philippines to determine their needs in evaluation and how evaluation is being practiced currently.

The Need for Initial Assessment

Before a program is started, institutions would conduct needs assessment. An evaluation of a need seeks to identify and measure the level of unmet needs within an organization (Posavac & Carey, 2003). The planning would then be guided by answering the needs that arises. Astin (1993) expresses the need for schools to evaluate regularly since the quality of education provided to students as well as services are based on it. The quality of education likewise is measured through evaluation. Conducting needs assessment, is concerned whether a problem or a need exist and to describe the problem of a program and then make recommendations for ways to reduce the problem. Basically needs assessment determines whether there is a sufficient need existing to initiate a

program and if there is, then there needs to be assistance in program planning by identifying potential program models and activities that might be conducted to achieve goals. McKillip (1998) identified five processes on needs analysis, which includes: (1) identification of users and uses, (2) description of the target population and service environment, (3) need identification, (4) needs assessment, and (5) communication. McKillip (1998) explains that needs assessment is to produce recommendations for action. Different studies may focus on the processing and monitoring a component of a program. Such studies focuses on whether the program is being delivered according to some delineated plan or model or may be more open–ended, simply describing the nature of delivery of the successes and problems encountered (Fitzpatrick, Worthen, & Sanders, 2004).

School wide Assessment

Educators need to pay attention to some alarms that might be sounding in their school and districts as they seek accountability through assessment. The alarms are associated with three extremely important areas of schooling; namely, the quality of instruction taking place in the classroom, the professional development required of teachers and provided by schools and districts, and the ethical standards expected of students and teachers (Ferrera, 2005). Vigilant administrators who are sincerely seeking effective assessment methods to be more accountable should take note of the following:

(1) Quality of instruction - Linda Darling-Hammond's (2005) research suggests that broader assessments actually raise standards and achievement. "The ability to make effective oral arguments and conduct significant research projects are considered essential skills by both employers and postsecondary educators ... these skills are very difficult to measure on a paper-and-pencil test" (Darling-Hammond, 2005). The issue is obviously the amount of instruction that seems one-sided. Balance of instructional strategies seems to be necessary for the quality of instruction to be high.

(2) Professional development - A recent report sponsored by the Spencer Foundation revealed that professional development activities that focused on accountability systems appeared to help teachers focus more on standards, but often resulted in misunderstood test data and rankings. Even more alarming were the "few organizational mechanisms that linked usable student performance data to teacher learning opportunities" (Berry, Turchi, Johnson, Hare, Owens, 2003).

(3) Ethical behavior - The Education Commission of the States has reported an increasing number of children suffering from sleep disorders and other stress-related maladies as a result of high-stakes testing systems connected with rigorous accountability efforts (Dounay, 2000). There is concern that increased cheating is the inevitable result of this pressure.

Assessment and Accountability

In the study reported by Morre, Dexter, Berube, and Beck (2005), they reviewed the literature on accountability and assessment in order to design a questionnaire to survey superintendents across Wyoming on their existing and needed knowledge about student assessment. Results on the presence or absence of gaps in knowledge that is deemed important by respondents and/or the literature can be used by colleges and universities in Wyoming, and perhaps elsewhere, to improve superintendent certification programs. Their report explained that the ability to plan assessment systems, to implement data-based decision making, to improve the classroom assessment used by teachers, and to communicate student assessment data requires technical knowledge in the area of student assessment. Arter, Stiggins, Duke, and Sagor (1993) articulated a set of 12 assessment competencies for principals and, by extension, superintendents. According to Arter et al. (1993), these instructional leaders should:

1. Know the attributes of sound student assessment and how to apply them to the assessments used in the school building;
2. Know the attributes of a sound student assessment system and how to apply them to the assessment systems used in the building;
3. Know issues related to ethical and inappropriate use of assessment information and how to protect students and staff from misuses;
4. Know the importance and features of assessment policies and regulations that contribute to the development and use of sound assessments at all levels of use;
5. Know the importance of and be able to work with staff members to set specific goals for integration of assessment into instruction, and to assist teachers in reaching those goals;
6. Know the importance of and be able to evaluate teachers' classroom assessment competencies and build such evaluations into the supervision process;
7. Know the importance of and be able to plan and present, or secure the presentation of, staff development experiences that contribute to the development and use of sound assessment at all levels of decision making;
8. Know the importance of and how to use assessment results for instructional improvement at the building level;
9. Know how to accurately analyze and interpret building-level assessment information;
10. Be able to act effectively upon assessment information;
11. Know and create the conditions necessary for the appropriate use of achievement information; and
12. Be able to communicate effectively with all interested members of the school community about assessment results and their relationship to instruction, (p. 5)

Warna (1995) stressed the importance of assessment to improve school performance. School administrators need to work with stakeholders in the evaluation process. Stakeholders are defined as individuals whose lives are affected by the program and whose decisions affect the future of the program (Greene, 1988). For educators this provides the broadest possible definition of school community, including as it does students, teachers, administrators, parents, school board members, central office personnel, and county residents. Stakeholder participation in the formal evaluation process may be fostered through individual interviews, group meetings, questionnaires, and open-ended feedback.

In a report by Duran (2005) an overview of factors to consider when evaluating the validity and reliability of interpretations and uses of results used for the purpose of complying with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act.1 A number of factors are identified and used to examine current interpretations and uses of assessment results for purposes of accountability. A concern is that sanctions and consequences may be imposed on schools through the use of invalid and unreliable results. Specific NCLB Act (NCLB) requirements are identified and used to examine this claim. The requirements include: The development and implementation of content and performance standards and standards-based assessments; Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) with a focus on potential negative impact based on immediate implementation and vague operational definitions; and sanctions and consequences. Clarification of interpretations and uses of results is provided to develop a better understanding for stakeholders who are responsible for making policy and educational decisions. In conclusion, the author suggests that the NCLB Act creates an opportunity for all states to develop and implement valid and reliable accountability systems that clearly and accurately identify effective schools and also provide adequate support to schools in need of improvement so that all students are able to receive quality and effective instruction that improves academic achievement and ultimately allows for students to reach their full potential.

Harada (2005) reports that evaluation is necessary in schools because it targets four goals of improvement. The function of assessment includes empowering student learning, informing instructional effectiveness, and communicating evidence of learning to parents, and winning support from administrators.

(1) Empowering Student Learning - By engaging students in assessment, we invite students to reflect on their own progress. Students more clearly understand what is expected. They connect new ideas to prior knowledge and strengthen their ownership over making the learning happen. Assessment also provides them with critical opportunities to give descriptive feedback as they are learning (Davies, 2000).

(2) Informing Instructional Effectiveness - Assessment provides the instructional team-classroom teachers, teacher-librarians, and additional school partners-with crucial information on what students are learning and how teaching might be shaped to help students do even better. Assessment provides

a map for planning curriculum and instructional activities (Harada & Yoshina, 2005). The result is more opportunities for peer learning and collaboration, more choices for students in the learning environment, and more integrated and interdisciplinary teaching (Falk, 2000).

(3) Communicating Evidence of Learning To Parents - While parents are interested in their children's scores on norm-referenced, standardized tests, they are also grateful for more personalized information that shows specific examples of what their children are actually learning. If students are creating their own learning portfolios, they include samples of their work; assessments of the samples; and reflections about what they learned, how they learned it, and what future directions they wish to pursue (Harada & Yoshina, 2005).

(4) Winning Support from Administrators - School leaders are besieged with much to do and limited resources and little time with which to do it. When they have to make decisions about allocating funds and staffing positions, they want evidence built on systematically collected data to make their determinations. They also need the evidence in capsulated formats. Providing this type of documentation builds a compelling case for the value of the library program. In short, communicating evidence of what is being learned through library instruction is a vital tool for library advocacy.

Supervision and Evaluation

Supervision is supposed to improve classroom teaching by enhancing teacher thinking, reflection, and understanding of teaching. Evaluation systems are supposed to increase effective teaching behaviors and enhance teacher professionalism. In a context of increased accountability-based, evaluation systems of all kinds, principals and teachers need to practice supervision and evaluation that facilitates meaningful adult learning (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). The result of their study indicates that for both teachers and principals, supervision was evaluation. Principals conducted evaluations, generally once a year, following the steps required by law: some kind of pre-observation conference, an observation based on an observation checklist, a post-observation conference, and signing and filing an official form. Teachers put on the required show, trying to display all the items on the observation checklist. As a result, neither supervision nor evaluation is done particularly well. Emphasis on the legal requirements of supervision and evaluation places principals in a hierarchical position over teachers. The principal determines the time, nature, and extent of supervision and evaluation. The principal observes, monitors, and checks the teacher. The principal informs the teacher regarding what needs to be changed or improved. The principal determines if improvement has occurred or progress has been made. The principal judges the effectiveness of a teacher's performance and assigns a performance rating. The teacher is subordinate to the principal. The teacher performs the show when required to do so by the principal, listens to the principal's judgment of the teacher's effectiveness, accepts the principal's judgment, and implements the principal's recommendations for change.

In the same way Bernstein (2004) expresses the same sentiments on supervision and evaluation. The explained that evaluation should be intended to support teacher growth, and evaluation should enhance teacher professionalism. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) started the initiative propositions on policy of what teachers should know and be able to do. The first three propositions are very much related to evaluation. These propositions include "supervision and evaluation procedures are committed to teacher growth." The proposition further explains that supervision and evaluation procedures that respect individual differences in teachers and can adjust accordingly must be based on an understanding of adult learning. Practices such as peer coaching, action research, and mentoring have that capacity. Using those practices, supervision is removed from the sole purview of the school administrator and shared among professional peers. By using a variety of such programs, teachers can be treated equitably without necessarily being treated equally. Stages of teacher development can be taken into account as trust with peers is established, feedback is relevant, and collaborative time is focused on the work of teaching. The second proposition states "supervision and evaluation supports teachers to learn content and employ a wide variety of pedagogical techniques." Supervision and evaluation procedures must, acknowledge that there is no one way to teach a subject to an individual child. Schools and teachers dependent on prescriptive programs should be encouraged to branch out. Schools and districts must create easy access for teachers to work with and observe their peers, to learn new curricular knowledge, and to enlarge their instructional repertoire. Teachers must have access to various forms of support from district and school administrators to take advantage of multiple paths of developing teacher knowledge. The third proposition states "supervision and evaluation procedures are responsible for managing and monitoring teacher growth." As teachers are engaged with peers and principals in supervision and evaluation, their learning must be relevant and link to past experiences. There must be support and teachers must be able to enlist their colleagues' knowledge and expertise. Accomplished peers and supervisors must command a range of techniques and programs and provide teachers with choices about when each is appropriate.

The Present Study

The body of literature in the conduct of proper evaluation and best practices are rich. Educators in other countries are also conscious on the use of evaluation and assessment results especially school administrators. They see the value of assessment to improve their practices and to aid them in making better decisions. There are no information available in the Philippine setting as to how educators and school personnel conducts evaluation. There are several reports in the evaluation of programs from external funding agencies but the process on how schools go about in evaluating their programs are not yet available in literature. The present study aims to conduct a needs assessment of schools in

the area of program evaluation in a province in the Southern Luzon region in the Philippines. The present study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Who commonly conducts the evaluation on the schools?
2. What activities are commonly evaluated on the schools?
3. What activities need evaluation improvement in the schools?
4. Who commonly handles the evaluation on the schools?
5. What are the different ways of gathering data for the purpose of evaluation among the schools?
6. What are the technical needs of schools in evaluation?
7. Is there a significant difference between private and public schools on their technical needs in evaluation?
8. What are the sources of information that schools use in coming up with an evaluation?
9. What are the ways to improve the practice of evaluation on schools?

Method

Participants

There are 37 respondents who participated in the study coming form 33 different institutions. There are 21 participants from private schools and 16 from the public schools. The position of the respondents varied that includes principals, directors, administrators, assistant principal, coordinators, and guidance counselors. The participants belong to the upper and middle level management positions.

Instrument

A needs assessment inventory focusing on the needs of schools in the area of evaluation of curricular programs was constructed. The inventory is composed of eight items that reflects how evaluation is practiced. It also identified the needs on various aspects of evaluation (See Appendix). The items identifies (1) whether evaluation is being conducted in the school, (2) activities evaluated, (3) activities the needs improvement, (4) personnel who handles the evaluation, (5) how data is gathered during evaluation, (6) areas in evaluation that needs technical assistance, (7) information where evaluation is taken, and (8) suggestions how to improve the evaluation.

A professor handling an evaluation course reviewed the items of the needs assessment inventory and it was revised for improvement. The inventory was pretested with few respondents to determine if the items are comprehensible.

Procedure

The instrument was constructed for the purpose of surveying the needs of schools on evaluation. The survey was reviewed and revised. It was administered to principals, assistant principals, coordinators, and other school heads from different schools in two provinces in the Southern Luzon Region of the Philippines. The participants were given a letter and the purpose of the needs assessment was explained to them. The administrators were asked to accomplish the survey form. Some surveys forms were answered immediately and others needed time to answer and requested to be retrieved in another time. After accomplishing the forms, the school heads were again debriefed about the purpose of the assessment.

Data Analysis

The responses were coded as 1 if the item is selected and 0 for those items that were not selected. In analyzing the data, the items with multiple responses were converted into percentage. The number of responses was counted and it was divided with the total number of responses and multiplied with 100 to approximate its proportion. For the item on technical needs on evaluation, the means and standard deviations were obtained. To interpret the weighted mean for each item the following range was used: 1.0–1.74 (Don't Know), 1.75–2.49 (Low Need), 2.5–3.24 (Moderate Need), 3.5–4.00 (High Need).

The public and private schools were compared on their technical needs on evaluation using the t-test for two independent samples. The alpha level of significance was set at .05.

The comments and suggestions on how to improve the evaluation process in schools were analyzed qualitatively using cluster analysis. The responses were grouped into emerging clusters.

Results

The responses for each item in the survey were counted by frequencies and converted into percentage for each item for conducting school evaluation, activities that schools evaluate, activities that needs evaluation improvement, persons who conduct the evaluation, data gathering procedures for evaluation, technical needs, sources of information, and suggestions to improve the practices of evaluation.

Most schools reported that they conduct evaluation (89.2%) and all of them are from the private schools. Four public schools (10.8%) indicated not conducting evaluations.

Table 1
Percentage of Conducting Evaluation in Schools

	Public		Private		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Evaluation is Conducted	12	75%	21	100%	33	89.2%
Evaluation is not conducted	4	25%	0	0%	4	10.8%
N	16	100%	21	100%	37	100.0%

Note. N=37

The activity that is mostly evaluated in schools is the teachers' performance (81.19%) since the teaching is one of the primary functions of a school. Then it is followed by teacher training (81.08%) which again refers to teacher performance. A large percentage is also evaluated on selecting students for academic and special awards (72.97%). The service feedback (43.24%) and student publications (48.64%) have lowest percentage being evaluated since these are not common in most schools.

Table 2
Activities that Schools Evaluate

Activities	Frequency	Percent
Teacher Performance	33	81.19%
Administrative Performance (*e.g., coordinator, principal, director, etc.*)	20	54.05%
Support Staff Performance	22	59.45%
Implementation of New Academic Programs	22	59.45%
Teacher Training Programs (*e.g., seminars, symposia, etc.*)	30	81.08%
Selecting Students for Academic and Special Awards	27	72.97%
Guidance and Counseling Programs	22	59.45%
Homeroom Guidance Program	21	56.76%
Administrative Services (*e.g., maintenance, engineering, accounting, etc.*)	19	51.35%
Student Organizations	25	67.57%
Student Publications	18	48.64%
Sports Development Program	22	59.45%
Cultural Activities	23	62.16%
Community Service	19	51.35%
Retreat, Recollection and other Formation Programs	21	56.75%
Service feedback	16	43.24%
Canteen/Cafeteria Evaluation	26	70.27%
Others, *please specify:*	1	2.70%
Total number of responses	387	

Note. N=37

Most schools reported that the activity selected that needs to be improved is on teacher training (37.83%) followed by teacher performance (32.43%). These two activities are the ones evaluated the most but the way they are being implemented needs improvement. There is a low percentage on service feedback (10.81%) since it is not mostly done in schools and still needs evaluation improvement.

Table 3
Activities that Needs Evaluation Improvement

Activities	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher Performance	12	32.43%
Administrative Performance *(e.g., coordinator, principal, director, etc.)*	9	24.32%
Support Staff Performance	7	18.92%
Implementation of New Academic Programs	10	27.02%
Teacher Training Programs *(e.g., seminars, symposia, etc.)*	14	37.83%
Selecting Students for Academic and Special Awards	5	13.51%
Guidance and Counseling Programs	9	24.32%
Homeroom Guidance Program	6	16.22%
Administrative Services *(e.g., maintenance, engineering, accounting, etc.)*	8	21.62%
Student Organizations	5	13.51%
Student Publications	5	13.51%
Sports Development Program	8	21.62%
Cultural Activities	6	16.22%
Community Service	8	21.62%
Retreat, Recollection and other Formation Programs	7	18.92%
Service feedback	4	10.81%
Canteen/Cafeteria Evaluation	10	27.03%
Others	0	0%
Total number of responses	133	

Note: N=37

The principal is mostly the one conducting the evaluation in schools (64.86%). This can be attributed to the role of principal as maintaining and monitoring the quality of schools, which makes evaluation part of the responsibility. High percentage is also obtained for the coordinators (40.54%) and guidance counselors conducting the evaluation (48.14%). The school president (2.70%), human resource (2.70%) and evaluation committee (2.70%) were reported of not conducting the evaluation in most schools.

Table 4
Persons who Conduct Evaluations

Persons	Frequency	Percentage
Guidance Counselor	13	48.14%
Teachers	11	29.72%
Principal	24	64.86%
Coordinators	15	40.54%
Assistant Principal	4	10.81%
Division Supervisor	4	10.81%
School President	1	2.70%
Director	4	10.81%
Human Resources	1	2.70%
Evaluation Committee	1	2.70%
Total number of responses	82	

Note. N=37

Observation is the most common data gathering procedure for obtaining evaluation data (83.78%) in most schools. There are several schools that use inventories and questionnaires (78.37%) when conducting evaluation. A large percentage also uses interviews (56.76%) and tests (56.76%) when evaluating. Very few of the schools use experiments (16.22%) and surveys (24.32%) when gathering evaluation data.

Table 5
Data Gathering Procedures for Evaluations

Procedures	Frequency	Percentage
Inventory/Questionnaires	29	78.37%
Focus Group Discussion	11	29.73%
Surveys	9	24.32%
Personal Interview	21	56.76%
Observation	31	83.78%
Tests	21	56.76%
Experiments	6	16.22%
Total number of responses	137	

Note. N=37

The selected schools reported a high need on the instrumentation as part of the process of evaluation (*M*=3.05) since not anyone has the skill to construct items and use framework guided by the domain assessed. The schools selected report that they have a moderate need in the process of data analysis (*M*=2.97), report writing (*M*=2.76), utilization of results (*M*=2.70), and dissemination of results (*M*=2.70). There is also a moderate need on the planning (*M*=2.84) and conceptualizing (*M*=2.89) of evaluation. The total mean score of the participants is 2.84 with a standard deviation of 1.11, which is moderate.

Table 6
Technical Needs on Evaluation

	N	M	SD	Interpretation
Planning the evaluation	37	2.84	1.191	Moderate Need
Conceptualization	37	2.89	1.100	Moderate Need
Instrumentation *(constructing assessment forms, etc.)*	37	3.05	1.026	Moderate Need
Data Analysis	37	2.97	1.013	Moderate Need
Report Writing	37	2.76	1.065	Moderate Need
Utilization of results	37	2.70	1.222	Moderate Need
Dissemination of results	37	2.70	1.175	Moderate Need
Others	0			
Total	37	2.84	1.11	Moderate Need

Note. N=37, 1.0 – 1.74: Don't Know, 1.75 – 2.49: Low Need, 2.5 – 3.24: Moderate Needs, 3.5 – 4.00:High Need

The global mean scores of the public and private schools were obtained and compared using the t-test for two independent samples. The *p* value obtained is 0.549 is greater than the alpha level of significance, there is no significant difference between the private and public schools in their technical needs in evaluation. This shows that both the public (*M*=20.63) has the same level of technical need in evaluation with the private school (*M*=19.38).

Table 7
Comparison of Public and Private Schools in their Technical Needs in Evaluation

Type of school	N	M	SD	SE	t	df	p value
Public	16	20.63	5.94	1.49			
Private	21	19.38	6.40	1.40	0.604	35	0.549

Note: *p<.05

Most of the participants indicated that they learn information on evaluation through seminars and workshops (78.38%). A large percentage also indicated that discussion groups (67.56%) and the Internet (62.16%) are sources of obtaining information in conducting evaluation. Few schools rely on colloquia (8.11%) as a source of information on evaluation.

Table 8
Source of Information when conducting Evaluation

Source of Information	Frequency	Percentage
Books	21	56.75%
Journals	16	43.24%
Internet	23	62.16%
Discussion Groups	25	67.56%
School-Based Experts	21	56.76%
External Experts	12	32.43%
Seminars/Workshops	29	78.38%
Colloquia	3	8.11%
Inter-school Collaboration/Consortium	15	40.54%
Accreditation/Certification Documents/Manuals	14	37.83%
Total number of responses	179	

Note. N=37

The responses from the comments and suggestions on improving the evaluation process in schools were listed then clustered into emerging themes where each strand would fall under. The strands were grouped into four clusters: Personnel, practice, relational, and faculty development.

The cluster on personnel refers to the characteristics of people who will perform the evaluation which includes qualification, training, expertise, and open mindedness. In this category, the respondents mentioned that "evaluation must be done by a qualified personnel," "evaluators in schools must be trained how to do evaluation," "leaders should know if their performance is effective," "people who evaluate must be experts," and "the administrators needs to be open minded"

The practice refers to strands on consistency of evaluation, areas that needs to be improved and specific courses of actions. The respondents gave comments like "conduct needs assessment," "evaluation must be consistent in a regular basis," "evaluation results should be well utilized," "evaluation should be done with sincerity," "evaluation should be implemented properly," "evaluation should be planned highly," "hire extra personnel for such function," "lessen the load of guidance counselors to do evaluations," "minimize school contests to concentrate on evaluation," "needs conceptualization," "Provide materials for improvement," "should be objective rather than subjective," and to "use data as basis for improvement."

The relational cluster emerged where respondents indicated having a "discussion" and "involvement" would improve the evaluation practice.

The faculty development cluster is based on suggestions such as training, workshops and observations on how evaluation is done. This basically refers to learning the rigors of evaluation. The suggestions of the respondents include to "have seminars to make more teaching effective," "observation," "seminar

about question technique," "seminar on Table of Specifications." Most of the responses focus on giving seminars in this category.

Table 9
Suggestions to Improve the Practices of Evaluation

Cluster	Strands	f	%
Personnel	• Evaluation must be done by a qualified personnel	3	8.11
	• Evaluators in schools must be trained how to do eval.	1	0.27
	• Leaders should know if their performance is effective	1	0.27
	• People who evaluate must be experts	3	8.11
	• The administrators needs to be open minded	1	0.27
Practice	• Always do assessment	1	0.27
	• Conduct needs assessment	1	0.27
	• do it on a regular basis	1	0.27
	• evaluation must be consistent	1	0.27
	• evaluation results should be well utilized	1	0.27
	• evaluation should be done with sincerity	1	0.27
	• evaluation should be implemented properly	1	0.27
	• evaluation should be planned highly	1	0.27
	• hire extra personnel for such function	1	0.27
	• lessen the load of guidance counselors to do evaluations	1	0.27
	• minimize school contests to concentrate on evaluation	1	0.27
	• needs conceptualization	1	0.27
	• Provide materials for improvement	1	0.27
	• should be objective rather than subjective	1	0.27
	• use data as basis for improvement	1	0.27
Relational	• Group discussion	1	0.27
	• Involvement	1	0.27
Faculty Development	• Have seminars to make more teaching effective	1	0.27
	• observation	1	0.27
	• seminar about question technique	1	0.27
	• seminar on Table of Specifications	1	0.27
	• seminars and workshops	1	0.27

Discussion

The needs of schools include: (1) to improve teacher performance and teacher training evaluation, (2) to consider alternative ways of evaluation such as focus group discussions and surveys, (3) high need on instrumentation as a technical skill, (4) seminars and workshops are rich venues for learning about the process of evaluation, (5) need to improve the personnel, practice, relational, and study aspects of evaluation in schools.

Principals who Conduct Evaluation in Schools

In most of the schools, the principal is reported who conducts the evaluation processes for different activities. The evaluation process goes hand in hand with supervision and thus they are accountable to the performance and monitoring in their school. Given their accountability, evaluation is a tool for them to monitor and maintain their performance standards. Given the

accountability of administrators like the principal, Ferrera (2005) noted that administrators should be vigilant and needs to seek effective assessment methods to be more accountable. Morre, Dexter, Berube, and Beck (2005) further explained that school administrators should have the ability to plan assessment systems, to implement data-based decision making, to improve the classroom assessment used by teachers, and to communicate student assessment data requires technical knowledge in the area of student assessment. Arter, Stiggins, Duke, and Sagor (1993) in their study emphasized the assessment competencies set of school principals. The findings show that principals play a key role in the conduct of evaluation on schools.

Schools Mostly Evaluate Teacher's Performance

The teaching process as implemented by teachers is one of the most important factors in education. The effectiveness of schools and development of students' competencies depends on the teachers' ability to effectively carry out teaching. Given the importance of teaching in schools, it is the foremost factor to be evaluated. Most of the studies on school evaluation primarily emphasize teaching as the one of the components that is evaluated. According to Darling-Hammond (2005) that balance of instructional strategies is deemed necessary for the quality of instruction to be high in evaluation. In the standards set by Arter, Stiggins, Duke, and Sagor (1993) emphasized that evaluators should know the importance of integrating assessment into instruction and to assist teachers in reaching their goals.

Improving the Evaluation for Teacher Performance and Teacher Training

The teaching is one of the primary functions that need to be evaluated in schools because the effectiveness in the facilitation of learning depends on this. The quality of teaching as performed by teachers are usually assessed by superiors such as the principal, assistant principal, and coordinators to ensure the quality of teaching being delivered to the students. Although this activity is widely assessed, there is a need for schools to improve the way they evaluate and assess their teachers. O'Donnel (1996) identified three dilemmas when evaluating teachers. The first is about the confusion about the supervisory judgment based on process rather than outcome where teachers find it easy to observe the processes. Second is the tension and potential contradiction between evaluating for development and arriving with summative performance, which is a misconception. And lastly, the disagreement between supervisors and teachers as to what constitutes ideal teaching behavior. Evaluating teacher training goes hand in hand in evaluating teacher performance. Most commonly, teacher trainings are given but the practices are not sustained continuously by supervisors and teachers. The process of evaluating the continuity of teacher training entails a long process and should be done before putting other teacher training programs. The report of Harada (2005) and Ferrera (2005) explains the benefits of assessing teacher performance and teacher training. What is lacking

perhaps in Philippine schools is the setting of standards on evaluations and education. The practice of evaluation in schools would most likely be within the proper standards if they follow and adhere to the set of standards like the No child left behind, NBPTS, and AEA evaluation guiding principles.

Alternative Ways of Conducting Evaluation

Most commonly, teachers are observed inside the classroom through pop-in visits and some teachers do not feel comfortable especially the ones not prepared. The worst part is that a pop-in visit is used to serve as a summative evaluation for a teachers' performance. Aside from the crude ways of observation, there is a call to use alternative ways of evaluation such as focus group discussions which generated qualitative data and provides a rich source of information in determining what areas does the teaching and learning needs to be improved or maintained. Some schools are not accustomed to qualitative methods where they remain positivistic in their approach on evaluation. Hughes-Hassell and Bishop (2004) used focus group discussion to determine the needs of librarians in schools. They explained that focus group interviews offer several benefits. In one hour, a teacher can gather the ideas, views or opinions of six to eight people instead of only one person. The social interaction involved in the interview typically helps participants focus on the most important aspects of a topic or issue, thus getting to the core of an issue in less time. Plus, the format allows the interviewer to probe for clarification or solicit greater detail throughout the interview, thus enhancing the completeness of the data collected.

Instrumentation as a Technical Skill

Constructing scales and items that measure a construct needs a highly trained psychometrician who is not usually available in schools. The findings indicate this to be highly needed and a call on skilled personnel on test construction is needed. The undergraduate degree in psychological testing in some universities like De La Salle University, Philippine Normal University, Mirriam College and University of the Philippines are offering courses where students are trained to construct their own measures (Magno, 2010). The students need to continue to enhance their skills in the field of measurement and evaluation where it is mostly needed. Part of the standards of the guiding principle in evaluation is the competence of the evaluator. The competence entails appropriate education, ability, skill, and experience in the area of measurement and evaluation.

Seminars and Workshops as Source to Learn the Process of Evaluation

Most teachers in the basic education are sent to seminars and forums in order to update and gain new insights on the teaching and learning process. This is a good opportunity for them to learn new things as indicated in the survey.

Seminars can focus on the area on measurement and evaluation to train teachers and administrators the rigors of evaluation in schools and programs. It was reported in the Philippine Human Development (2000) that the capacities of colleges and universities to offer quality teacher-training programs are strained but the approach is still popular. As a result, teacher training has expanded rapidly only at great sacrifice of quality. It was even emphasized that even today there are only a handful of teacher training institutions that offer relatively high quality programs. There are only reported feeble attempts in later years to remedy the poor quality of teacher training as a result the quality is still poor.

The Need to Improve Personnel, Practice, Relational, and the Study of Evaluation

It is expressed in the qualitative data that there is need for trained personnel and practices of evaluation that should be improved in schools. It is also helpful if the staff engaged with each other to carefully plan how the evaluation is going to take place (relational). The faculty development aspect of evaluation opens the opportunity of teachers to be trained in the conduct of evaluation. These findings support the report of Berry, Turchi, Johnson, Hare, and Owens (2003) that there is few organizational mechanism that link usable students performance data to teacher learning opportunities. Because of this scenario, professional development activities that focused on accountability systems appeared to help teachers focus more on standards. Even professional development activities are given like seminars, these often resulted in misunderstood test data and rankings.

Implications

The major findings in the study show that most schools conduct their evaluation concentrating on teacher performance, however, the process needs to be improved. Most often, the principal is the one conducting the evaluation using inventories and questionnaires to gather evaluation information. Although, expertise in the use of instrumentation appears to be a great need. Schools commonly rely on seminars as intervention to update them on the trends in evaluation. The implication of the needs assessment conducted is that schools have not realized yet their need to improve their evaluation practices. This is primarily because of the low exposure of the school administrators and teachers on empirical studies and reports that provides updated information on the field of educational evaluation. Although, their practice of evaluation is concentrated on teachers' performance since it is a primary concern, their major belief is that faculty development will provide for whatever gaps in knowledge they have.

Based on the results of the needs assessment, it is concluded that schools have a need to improve the manner in conducting their evaluation in terms of the following:

1. The schools a need to improve the evaluation of their curricular programs in terms of teacher performance and teacher training.

2. There is a need to include all staff and personnel in schools especially the teachers to perform evaluation in various educational programs of the school.
3. The schools need to use other means of gathering qualitative data such as focus group discussions since they are only limited on quantitative approaches.
4. The schools need to source out experts and technical reports on the proper way of conducting evaluation.
5. The schools need further training to equip them in the conduct of proper evaluation especially in terms of instrumentation.

Given the results of the needs assessment, the following are recommended for the administrators and principals in the selected schools:

1. Conceptualize a set of standards in conducting evaluation in schools by collaborating with other schools in the same district.
2. Share resources in evaluation such as reports in evaluation studies and methodologies so that the procedures employed are not always traditional.
3. Encourage other school personnel to engage in evaluation activities like teachers and guidance counselors.
4. Establish a separate office that is concentrated on performing evaluation and assessment tasks for the school.
5. Be open to new methodologies, procedures, and principles in administration that would include a system of feedback and assessment.

The following are recommended for teachers and school staff in the schools:

1. Engage in evaluation activities for various school programs such as student organizations and curriculum. This will provide accurate information on which area needs to be improved.
2. Participate willingly and be open to recommendations of experts in line with evaluation and assessment but still maintaining a critical mindset.
3. Ask for school support when conducting evaluation studies such as deloading, grant, and other incentives.
4. Enroll in courses such as measurement and evaluation offered by reputable schools in order to gain the appropriate perspective in conducting evaluation in schools.

The following are recommended for the next researcher in conducting needs assessment:

1. Include a mechanism in the assessment whether schools are truly conducting the real nature of evaluation and not just assessment by exhibiting evaluation reports.
2. Use other methodologies to get in-depth information on the status of evaluation in schools such as interview and focus group discussions.
3. Perform a research synthesis on the evaluation content of one area of schools in order to gain a more detailed insight on the status of evaluation and the rigors on how it is conducted.

References

American Evaluation Association, "*Guiding Principles for Evaluators: A report from the AEA Task Force on Guiding Principles for Evaluators,*" by D. Newman, M. A. Schreir, W. Shadish, & C. Wye. Available on-line: eval.org/EvaluationDocuments/

Arter, J. A., Stiggins, R. J., Duke, D., & Sagor, R. (1993). Promoting assessment literacy among principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 77*(556), 1-7.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *Assessment of excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Arizona: The Oryx press.

Bernstein, E. (2004). What teacher evaluation should know and be able to do: A commentary. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*, 80-89.

Berry, B. et al. (November 2003). "The Impact of High-Stakes Accountability on Teachers' Professional Development: Evidence from the South." A Final Report to the Spencer Foundation. Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, Inc.

Berube, W. G, Gaston, J., & Stepans, J. L. (2002, December). The role of the principal in teacher professional development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Estes Park, CO.

Darling-Hammond, L. (n. d.). Multiple measures approaches to high school graduation: A Review of state student assessment policies. [on-line available] vvww. Schoolredesign.net/srn/mm/mm/ php

Davies, A. (2000). *Making classroom assessment work*. Merville, BC: Connections Publishing.

Dounay, J., (n. d.) High-stakes testing, Systems. [on-line available] www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/14/56/1456.htm

Duran, A. (2005). Factors to Consider When Evaluating School Accountability Results. *Journal of Law and Education, 34*, 73-101.

Falk, B. (2000). *The heart of the matter: Using standards and assessment to learn*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ferrera, R. J. (2005). Accountability ALARMS. *Leadership, 35*, 24-26.

Greene, J. (1988).Stakeholder participation and utilization in program evaluation. *Evaluation Review, 2*, 91-116.

Harada, V. H. (2005). Working smarter: Being strategic about assessment and accountability. *Teacher Librarian, 33*, 8-16.

Harada, V. H., & Yoshina, J. M. (2005). *Assessing learning: Librarians and teachers as partners*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Hughes-Hassell, S., & Bishop, K. (2004). Using focus group interviews to improve library services for youth. *Teacher Librarian, 32*, 8-13.

Magno, C. (2010). A brief history of educational assessment in the Philippines. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review, 1*, 140-149.

McKillip, J. (1998). Need analysis: process and techniques. In L. Bickman and D. J. Rog (eds.), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moore, A. D., Dexter, R. R., Berube, W. G., & Beck, C. H. (2005). Student assessment: What do superintendents need to know?*Planning and Changing, 36*, 68-70.

O'Donnell, J. (1996). *For the chosen few: A guide to classroom supervision*. Manila: Cacho Publishing House.

Ponticell, J. A. & Zepeda, S. J. (2004). Confronting Well-Learned Lessons in Supervision and Evaluation. National Association of Secondary School Principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*, 43-50.

Posavac, E. J. (2003). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Philippine Human Development Report (2000). *Quality, access, and relevance in basic education*. Human Development Network and United Nations Development Programme.

Warna, G. D. (1995). Program evaluation for school improvement: Guidelines for school administrators. National Association of Secondary School Principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 79*, 76.

Appendix

Survey of Needs Assessment

1. Is evaluation done in your school? ___ Yes ___ No
   If NO, please proceed to item #5.

2. Which of the following activities do you evaluate?
   (Indicate your response in __Column I__. You may check as many as applicable.)

   Column

I	II		
___	___	a.	Teacher Performance
		b.	Administrative Performance *(e.g., coordinator, principal, director, etc.)*
___	___	c.	Support Staff Performance
___	___	d.	Implementation of New Academic Programs
___	___	e.	Teacher Training Programs *(e.g., seminars, symposia, etc.)*
___	___	f.	Selecting Students for Academic and Special Awards
___	___	g.	Guidance and Counseling Programs
___	___	h.	Homeroom Guidance Program
		i.	Administrative Services *(e.g., maintenance, engineering, accounting, etc.)*
___	___	j.	Student Organizations
___	___	k.	Student Publications
___	___	l.	Sports Development Program
___	___	m.	Cultural Activities
___	___	n.	Community Service
___	___	o.	Retreat, Recollection and other Formation Programs
___	___	p.	Service feedback
___	___	q.	Canteen/Cafeteria Evaluation
___	___	r.	Others, *please specify:*

   _____
   _____

3. Of the activities you checked in question no. 2, which needs to be improved?
   (Indicate your response in __Column II__. You may check as many as applicable.)

4. Who handles the evaluation in your school?

   ___ Guidance Counselor   ___ Teachers   ___ Coordinators   ___ Assistant Principal
   ___ Principal   ___ Others, *please specify:* _____

5. How do you gather data for evaluation purposes? *(You may check as many as applicable.)*

   ___ Inventory/Questionnaires   ___ Surveys   ___ Tests
   ___ Focus Group Discussions   ___ Observations   ___ Experiment
   ___ Personal Interview   ___ Others, *please specify:*
   _____

6. In which of the following areas in evaluation would you need technical assistance?

	High Need	Moderate Need	Low Need	Don't Know
a. Planning the evaluation				
b. Conceptualization				
c. Instrumentation *(constructing assessment forms, etc.)*				
d. Data Analysis				
e. Report Writing				
f. Utilization of results				
g. Dissemination of results				
h. Others, please specify: _____ _____ _____				

7. Where do you get information regarding evaluation? *(You may check as many as applicable.)*

_____ a. Books
_____ b. Journals
_____ c. Internet
_____ d. Discussion Groups
_____ e. School-Based Experts
_____ f. External Experts
_____ g. Seminars/Workshops
_____ h. Colloquia
_____ i. Inter-school Collaboration/Consortium
_____ j. Accreditation/Certification Documents/Manuals
_____ k. Others, *please specify:*
_____
_____

8. What are your suggestions to improve the practice of evaluation in schools?

Background Information About the Respondent

Name *(optional)*: _____

Current job position: _____

Number of years in this institution: _____

Year of establishment of school: _____

School population:
- Elementary   _____
- High School   _____
- College   _____
- Graduate School   _____