Chapter 6

Evaluation in Distance Education

S. Joseph Levine

Introduction

The challenge of evaluation in distance education is both a complex and confusing enterprise. Most of us would like to merely get on with it, do an evaluation of our distance education program, and not spend an inordinate amount of time defining evaluation terms, clarifying evaluation concepts, and being confused with semantic differences that are apparent whenever the topic of evaluation is presented. However, the truth is that we must work our way through all of the terms, concepts, and semantic differences if we are ever to move to the point of being able to construct and implement meaningful evaluation in distance education. The good news is that once we understand the “playing field”, our evaluation practice can become a rather simple task, instead of a daunting challenge.

A major challenge of evaluation in distance education emanates from the very distance that exists between the learner and the teacher. This distance creates a situation whereby the control of the teacher is reduced and the control of the learner is increased. And, of course, as the teacher’s control is reduced so is the teacher’s ability to completely control the design and implementation of evaluation strategies. It is imperative, therefore, that the educator in distance education explore evaluation strategies that provide for increased ways in which the learner can exercise control for the purpose of individual growth and development. Without such recognition of the enhanced role played by the learner in distance education, evaluation runs the risk of becoming a meaningless exercise that yields little valuable information. Involvement of the learner in the evaluative process is essential in a well designed distance education program.

This chapter has been organized around a set of three discrete and powerful concepts that could form the basis for the successful selection, design, and implementation of evaluation strategies in distance education, especially evaluation strategies that accommodate a concern for significant learner involvement.

At the conclusion of this chapter you will:

1. Be able to differentiate between **measurement**, **assessment**, and **evaluation** and know when each level is most appropriate in distance education.

2. Understand that evaluation strategy changes in relation to the recipient of the evaluation results. The intended audience for the evaluation results directly influences the type of evaluation that is used. For instance, an evaluation that is to be presented in a report to a **sponsoring agency or group** is inherently different from one that a **teacher or instructional designer** might use to get better insight into the teaching process used in the distance education program or from an evaluation that would help the **learners** assess their own learning at a distance.
3. Appreciate that evaluation can be used at different times during and after a distance education program in order to allow the examination of different program elements. Key elements that could be examined include the inputs that were selected, the processes that were used, the products and outputs that were achieved, and the outcomes or impacts that affected the lives of the learners, their community, or their organizations. Evaluation differs in purpose and in difficulty, depending on which element is to be evaluated.

4. Be able to identify actual evaluation instruments in terms of the above characteristics.

Differentiating Between Measurement, Assessment, and Evaluation

Evaluation consists of the merging of three very powerful ideas – the collection of information, the comparing of that information against another set of information, and the placement of value on the comparison. If we are going to truly conduct evaluation, we have to accommodate all three ideas. Major errors that are made in the practice of evaluation frequently occur because the evaluator assumes that once the first step has been conducted, the information has been collected, an evaluation has been conducted. Or, going a step further but still being short of a true evaluation, the evaluator assumes that once the collected information has been compared to another set of information, the evaluation has been accomplished. Evaluation can be fulfilled only when all three steps in the process have been fulfilled – collection of information, comparison of information with another set of information, and making a value judgment on the comparison. “Both description and judgment are essential – in fact, they are the two basic acts of evaluation. Any individual evaluator may attempt to refrain from judging or from collecting the judgments of others. Any individual evaluator may seek only to bring to light the worth of the program. But their evaluations are incomplete. To be fully understood, the educational program must be fully described and fully judged” (Stake, 1967, p. 3).

The first level or step toward a full educational evaluation of a distance education program can be considered an educational measurement. Measurement consists of a single set of information regarding some aspect of the distance education program. It is presented as fact with no attempt to compare it with anything else or to assign any value to the information.

A measurement is the clear presentation of a set of scores, outcomes, or information that has been drawn from an instructional program. It is like a snapshot or a single picture taken of a program with no attempt to compare the picture to another picture, that is, another program, criteria, expectation, or different point in time.

**Educational Measurement**

*(A snapshot/single picture of an educational program.)*

Measurement statements:

*The distance education learners scored a combined 87% on the final examination.*
The concept of a t-test was learned by all learners at the 3 downlink locations. Clarity of materials, flexibility of learning times, and prompt feedback were rated 4.8 by the learners on a 5.0 scale.

The second step toward an educational evaluation is that of assessment. Two different measures or sets of information are brought together to allow comparison. However, no attempt is made to assign any value to the similarity or difference between the two sets of information.

Educational assessment is the comparison of two measurements.

**Measurement I**
(Pre-Test, Program A, Time A, Criteria, Expected Outcomes, etc.)

**Compared With**

**Measurement II**
(Post-Test, Program B, Time B, Actual Outcomes, etc.)

= **Assessment**

Assessment statements:

*The distance education learners scored a combined 87% on the final examination, which was 4% higher than the same class taught in a face-to-face situation.*

*The concept of a t-test was learned by all learners at the 3 downlink locations of which only 10% knew the concept at the beginning of the course. Clarity of materials, flexibility of learning times, and prompt feedback were rated 4.8 by the learners on a 5.0 scale. A rating of 4.0 was identified in the funding proposal as the minimum acceptable mean rating.*

And finally we can move on to educational evaluation or the comparing of two sets of information and the placement of value on this comparison.

Evaluation statements:

*The distance education class surpassed our prediction when they scored a combined 87%, which was 4% higher than the same class taught in a face-to-face situation.*

*Great improvement was shown when the concept of a t-test was learned by all learners at the 3 downlink locations of which only 10% knew the concept at the beginning of the course.*

*The computer-based correspondence program exceeded expectations when clarity of materials, flexibility of learning times, and prompt feedback were rated 4.8 by the learners on a 5.0 scale. A rating of 4.0 was identified in the funding proposal as the minimum acceptable mean rating.*

For instance, we may have data that describe the learning outcomes of a face-to-face instructional
program (a measurement). When these data are compared with similar data drawn from a distance education program (another measurement), we are on the road toward evaluation. First, though, we are faced with an assessment or comparing the two sets of information.

\[
\text{Comparison of face-to-face learning outcomes (measurement) with distance education learning outcomes (measurement)} = \text{Assessment}
\]

Next, when we assign a value to this assessment, we have arrived at evaluation.

\[
\text{Comparison of Two Sets of Learning Outcomes (Assessment)} + \text{Placement of Value} = \text{Evaluation}
\]

But why in the world would someone want to stop at assessment, the comparing of two sets of information, when turning it into an evaluation could easily be achieved by just adding a statement of value to the comparison? The answer, of course, is politics and risk. The minute we place a value on the comparison, we are opening ourselves to risk. What if the learning outcomes of a distance education instructional program are not greater than those of a face-to-face program? We might want to merely state those facts (assessment) or go on to say that the face-to-face program was better (evaluation). The decision is ours! However, we must remember that assessment and evaluation are not the same thing. To move to the level of an evaluation demands that a value be placed on the outcomes of an assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words that can indicate an assessment</th>
<th>Words that can indicate an evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More (Less)</td>
<td>Better (Worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater (Lesser)</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger (Smaller)</td>
<td>Stronger (Weaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher (Lower)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farther (Closer)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louder (Softer)</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased (Reduced)</td>
<td>Enriched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good (Bad)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some, even the use of assessment, the comparing of two sets of information, can be perceived as a high risk. These educators fear that the mere presentation of information in the form of an educational assessment is just waiting for someone to assign it a value and then turn it into an evaluation.
Considering the Purpose or Use of an Evaluation

A large trap that many evaluators (assessors or measurers) fall into is assuming that one type of evaluation can successfully respond to the unique questions of a variety of different interested parties.

One influence on the direction of evaluation is its potential audience. During the formative evaluation the project writers and policy makers are the prime, although not sole, audience for the evaluation efforts. During both formative and summative evaluations, the funders are generally concerned with progress. The schools participating in the experimental use of materials are interested and deserve reports of the efforts in which they are involved. For publicly funded projects, the public has a right to be kept informed on the use of its funds, and provisions for such information should be considered an obligation even where the funding agency does not require it. (Grobman, 1968, p. 15.)

An evaluation conducted to specifically answer questions of the teacher might be inappropriately sent on to the agency that is funding the program. Clearly, the sorts of answers that the teacher had planned to get from the evaluation would be quite different from the sorts of questions the funding agency would like to have answered. Or, an exercise to help distant learners better understand how to improve their own self-discipline for learning via a satellite-delivered program is inappropriately used by the producer of the satellite program to find segments that need to be replaced with new content. An evaluation designed to provide insights to the distance learners would be very different from one designed to help the producer identify content that needs to be changed. Both of these examples describe the inappropriate use of an evaluation to fulfill a secondary purpose.

Three Major Recipients of Evaluation Results

To Inform LEARNER

To Inform AGENCY/SPONSOR/COMMUNITY

To Inform TEACHER/INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGNER

Purpose - Evaluation Intended to Inform the Agency/Sponsor/Community. Clearly the use that is most often the basis for an evaluation is a concern for accountability by the group that has sponsored the program. Tyler (1991) refers to this as program evaluation that is used to “provide estimates of effects and costs” (p. 4). It is a most appropriate expectation for a sponsoring group to want to find out to what extent its assistance has “paid off.” Has the program focused on the purpose that was intended? Have the program objectives been achieved? Have the observable outcomes been in line with what was originally planned? Was the program a good investment? These questions and other similar ones form the basis for what Michael Scriven (1967) originally referred to as summative
**Evaluation** or evaluation that occurs at the conclusion of a program and is intended to look at effects in a conclusive manner.¹

Evaluation that intends to inform the agency, sponsor, or community could be truly evaluation, but often it stops just short of being an evaluation and takes the form of assessment whereby two sets of information are compared and no defined value is placed on the comparison. One set of information for the assessment is that which is collected at the conclusion of the program. These data may be drawn from participant observations, cognitive testing, instructor reactions, or other ex post facto forms of data. The second set of information, that which allows an assessment to be made, is often taken from the preliminary plan for the program. According to Stake (1967), these are the “intended student outcomes” that are part of the original vision for the program.

Statements of expected or intended outcomes, as presented in the initial program plan, are compared with the data collected at the end of the program and a comparison is made. It is then possible to make a clear comparison between what was intended and what was achieved, that is, an assessment of the program. Such assessments are very common and are often referred to as an evaluation, but typically they omit the drawing of judgments regarding the comparison. They are therefore really summative assessments.

**Summative Assessment:**

**Intended to Inform the Agency/Sponsor/Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Information Drawn from Program Plan Regarding Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment (Comparing A &amp; B)</th>
<th>B. Information Drawn at Conclusion of Program Regarding Actual Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Purpose - Evaluation Intended to Inform the Teacher/Instructional Designer.** A second popular use for evaluation, though not as frequently employed as the above, is to inform those responsible for providing the instructional program. Data are collected that help the instructor and others involved with the design and delivery of the distance education program get a sense of how they are doing and what might be changed if the program were to be repeated. This type of focus for an evaluation is seen as developmental in nature, one that builds and changes over time, and the evaluation is called **formative** since it is designed to help **form** the program in new ways or to make improvements in the program. Collection of data is not reserved exclusively for the conclusion of the program. Data are collected throughout the program and continually compared with the planned or expected data. Value is assigned to these comparisons, and judgments are made regarding how “good” the program is and what aspects might need “improvement” or “refinement.” Changes and improvements in the program are able to be made “on the run” to take full advantage of the information that is being collected as it is collected.

---

¹ On the other hand, formative evaluation refers to that form of evaluation that is done to make improvements in a program. Summative evaluation, when compared to formative evaluation, was expressed well by Robert Stake when he described the difference as the difference between when the cook tastes the soup (formative evaluation) and when the guest tastes it (summative evaluation).
**Formative Evaluation:**
**Intended to Inform the Teacher/Instructional Designer**

**Purpose - Evaluation Intended to Inform the Learners.** The evaluation use that is least often implemented is that which is created to inform the learners, that is, to let the learners self-reflect in order to let them know whether they are being successful, whether their goals and objectives are being attained, and if they have made a good investment of their time and energy in the distance education program. Such learner-focused evaluation is often an instinctive part of the learning process and goes on unobtrusively and rather automatically. Seldom is evaluation that is intended to inform the learners made explicit through a strategy implemented by a teacher or learning facilitator in a distance education setting. Instead it often occurs haphazardly as a function of the learner’s own desire to evaluate. However, since distance education demands a high degree of self-direction on the part of the learner, it follows that evaluation that is intended to inform the learner should be made a significant focus for evaluation in distance education.

Evaluation that is implemented with the intention of informing the learners is very different from evaluation that is designed to inform the teacher, who, in turn, informs the learner. Evaluation that is truly designed to inform the learner and remove the teacher from a “middle person” role, could be viewed as **empowering evaluation.** Such evaluation often is based on reflective opportunities, times when learners are encouraged to reflect on their learning. These times are built into the instructional program. Garrison (2003) writes, “Transactional elements within a critical community of inquiry will have to be articulated for distance education to be relevant and flourish in this communication age” (p. 166).
To encourage reflective opportunities in support of empowering evaluation, it is important to provide enhanced opportunities for dialogue and for learners to interact directly with each other. Such opportunities may be as simple as the distance instructor providing time and structure that allow learners to give written feedback to each other via a bulletin board or the use of small group discussions that are conducted by learners via email without the intervention of the instructor. These reflective or evaluative activities can have a significant empowering effect on the learners.

It is often hard to differentiate evaluation that is intended to inform the learners from a highly learner-interactive distance education program. A hallmark of such a highly interactive program is the considerable amount of responsibility that the teachers share with the learners.

**Empowering Evaluation: Intended to Inform the Learners**
A comprehensive approach to evaluation in distance education should include some aspect of each of the three uses for evaluation: to inform the agency, sponsor, or community; to inform the teacher or instructional designer; and to inform the learners.

**Comparing the Three Purposes of Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation that is intended to:</th>
<th>Can be labeled:</th>
<th>And is usually described as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform the Agency/Sponsor/Community</td>
<td>Summative Assessment</td>
<td>Most frequently used Expected by the funding agency Reflects back on original intentions Occurs at the conclusion of the program Only an assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the Teacher/Instructional Designer</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>Often used Helps the designer make changes Occurs in an ongoing manner Developmental in nature Immediately useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform the Learners</td>
<td>Empowering Evaluation</td>
<td>Least frequently used Controlled by the learners Self-reflective in nature An instinctive part of the learning process Helpful when the educator makes it explicit Builds on learner-learner interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considering Which Aspect of the Distance Education Program Will Be Evaluated**

With distance education, more so than other less technologically based forms of education, the question of which aspect of the program will be evaluated becomes a major focus. This question occurs because there seems to be so many more aspects to consider! Will we be evaluating the array of equipment and technology that has been brought together to facilitate teaching at a distance (e.g., computer software, telephone lines, CODEC units, interactive classrooms)? Or, will we be evaluating learning to gain a sense of exactly what changes have taken place in the learners? And, if we are evaluating change as a result of learning, will we be looking at recall immediately following the distance education program or will we be considering the application of the learning months after the conclusion of the program? These and other similar questions become the basis for considering the specific aspects of the program that will be evaluated.

Kaufman (1983), in a chapter focusing on needs assessment, presents the Organizational Elements Model (OEM), which provides a very helpful perspective on five separate elements or aspects that can be the basis for evaluation. Kaufman (1983) presents his elements in a sequential manner based upon their occurrence within an educational program.

**The Organizational Elements Model (OEM)**
Roger A. Kaufman (1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Efforts</th>
<th>Organizational Results</th>
<th>Societal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Efforts (Inputs and Processes).** The first two elements are referred to as Organizational Efforts and describe the array of resources and teaching-learning methods that are orchestrated by the educator and educational organization. The Organizational Efforts – inputs and processes – are those aspects of a distance education program that are under the complete control of the educator and are designed and delivered by the educator in such a manner to facilitate learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Efforts</th>
<th>Examples in Distance Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Access Locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Bulletin Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of Topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Feedback from Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Discussion Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Field Trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Contact Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Efforts are those efforts that are most controlled by the educator or organization. And, it logically follows that the organizational efforts are also those parts of the educational program that are the easiest to evaluate. As a result, it is the organizational efforts that are most often the focus for evaluation.

Questions that can be answered through an evaluation of Organizational Efforts might include:

- *Was the selected technology appropriate for the learners? content? (Inputs)*
- *Was the selected technology appropriate for the content? (Inputs)*
- *Did the instructor provide sufficient structure to allow an appropriate comfort level for the learners? (Processes)*
- *Were appropriate educational resources available to the learners in a convenient and timely manner? (Inputs)*
- *Did the technical systems operate as expected? Did breakdowns occur? (Inputs)*
- *Were the learners able to maintain the pace that was established for the program? (Processes)*

It becomes clear that an examination of learning is not a function of an evaluation of Organizational Efforts. Learning evaluation, evaluation which examines the degree to which change has taken place, is a function of an examination of Organizational Results.

**Organizational Results (Products and Outputs).** Products and outputs, what Kaufman (1983) labels as Organizational Results, moves evaluation away from those aspects that the organization is responsible for putting into place and focuses on the results that accrue from their efforts. Organizational Results are often seen as countable phenomena that allow the organization to suggest with some assuredness that certain specific outcomes have been achieved as a result of its efforts. These achievements, directly related to the distance education program, can be as diverse as the
completion of certificates and degrees or the acquisition of specific knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations (Bennett, 1975). The examination of Organizational Results is often what most distance educators have in mind when they go about the challenge of evaluation. It is understood that to achieve meaningful Organizational Results demands the appropriate implementation of meaningful Organizational Efforts. The two are clearly linked and the way to insure their viability is through evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Products** | Number of Students Completing a Program  
Number of Certificates Issued  
Number of Degrees Awarded  
Specific Knowledge, Attitudes, Skills and Aspirations Acquired  
Number of Learners Who Have Passed an Examination  
Validation of a Specific Program  
Documentation of the Use of an Instructional Technology |
| **Outputs** | Public Awareness of the Distance Education Program  
Increased Use of Local Learning Resources  
Learner Application of Skills  
Increased Participation by Distance Education Learners in Various Programs |

Kaufman (1983) cautions that our understanding of the words “Products,” “Outputs,” and “Outcomes” is important and that unfortunately “common language usage intermix these three words” (p. 55). His own defining of the terms is precise and provides a very helpful guideline for considering the two types of Organizational Results and also the difference between Organizational Results and Societal Impact, which, according to Kaufman (1983), is the essence of Outcomes.

Questions that can be answered through an evaluation of Organizational Results might include:

*How have the graduates of this program impacted the local community? (Outputs)*
*In what way have the learners involved with the distance education program been able to make meaningful use of the skills that have been taught? (Outputs)*
*How many learners that began the distance education program were able to successfully complete the program? (Products)*

**Societal Impact (Outcomes).** Kaufman’s (1983) view of evaluation is very expansive. The focus moves beyond the individual learner and clearly brings into focus the greater community and the potential that education has for affecting change at that level. In Kaufman’s (1983) words, a major role of education is as a “means to societal ends” (p. 56). Outcomes are seen as the impact that Outputs have in and for society. “These are the external or outside-of-school results (or indicators of results) that determine the utility of organizational efforts and organizational results in and for society” (Kaufman, 1983, p. 56).

Within the context of distance education, a concern for Societal Impact allows us to go beyond the mere concern for elaboration of technology or self-indulging learning and, instead, develop a sense of the value of learning at a distance within the greater context of society. It significantly strengthens our position and stretches our thinking to look past considering only the learner and his or her own immediate learning needs and creates a greater sense of community as the basis for ultimate change.
Distance education evaluation that encompasses a concern for Societal Impact looks to the contribution that learning and learners make and the contribution that the program has made to the self-sufficiency of learners and society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal Impact</th>
<th>Examples in Distance Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>New Legislation by Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Community Participation in Local Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in the Local Job Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Initiatives in the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution of Community Problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions that can be answered through an evaluation of Societal Impact might include:

*In what ways is the community now better able to accommodate new voices in decision making since the distance education program was offered? (Outcomes)*

*What have been the long term effects of the program on the responsiveness of the organization in dealing with issues? (Outcomes)*

*How have the lives of the learners been enriched in unexpected ways since the conclusion of the program? (Outcomes)*

**The Challenge of Evaluation in Distance Education**

All forms of education evaluation play a major role in justifying programs, improving practice, and projecting into the future. However, in distance education, where the learner has the potential to move away from the control of the teacher and operate in very autonomous ways, it is essential that the practice of evaluation be moved closer to the learner. Moving evaluation closer to the learner demands that evaluation be appropriately influenced by the learner’s needs of growth and development. Through appropriate learner-focused evaluation practice in distance education, it is possible to recognize the learner as a major partner in the teaching-learning environment, which is something that can be too easily overlooked in face-to-face learning situations. Evaluation in distance education must be carefully balanced between a traditional view that allows for program justification or development and a new view that has the potential for empowering learners.
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Examples of Evaluation Instruments and Their Application in Distance Education

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Recipient of Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Program Element to be Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Measurement</td>
<td>Agency/Sponsor/Community</td>
<td>X Inputs (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Summative Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>X Instructor/Developer</td>
<td>X Processes (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Formative Evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Learners (Empowering Evaluation)</td>
<td>Products (Organizational Results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs (Organizational Results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes (Societal Impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will data be used?
To establish some baseline information and identify possible aspects of the project that should be considered in the future for improvement/change.

Johnson County Extension Service
At-Home Video Learning Program
Feedback Form

To improve the Basic Family Economics at-home video learning program we would appreciate if you would complete the following items.

The strengths of Basic Family Economics were:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

The weaknesses of Basic Family Economics were:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

If another video learning program was to be developed for at-home use, it should include:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

General Comments about the video learning program:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please return your completed feedback form when you return the DVD.

Thank You!
Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Recipient of Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Program Element to be Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Inputs (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor/Developer</td>
<td>Processes (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>Products (Organizational Results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs (Organizational Results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes (Societal Impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Family Economics
Web-Based Learning Module

Unit 2 Test

1. The major obstacles to good family economic planning are:
   - ___ Lack of ability
   - ___ Poor time management
   - ___ Inability to communicate with each other in family
   - ___ Lack of sufficient funds
   - ___ Misunderstanding

2. Most families, when faced with a major economic problem, turn to:
   - ___ Friends and family
   - ___ Financial agencies (bank, credit union, etc.)
   - ___ Financial planners
   - ___ No one

3. Economics is a concept:
   - ___ unknown to most people
   - ___ familiar to everyone
   - ___ only understood by a few
   - ___ that only applies to people with a lot of money

How will data be used?
To provide an immediate check of learning that is taking place as a basis for possible justification of the program.
It appears that all of the Learning Groups are now functioning very well. Congratulations!

The following is an individual task that I would like to ask each of you to do. There will be no grade for this task and you are not required to send copies of your emails to me. I hope you will find this task valuable for your own learning.

Here is the task –

1) Prepare an email in response to the following assignment. Send you email to each member of your Learning Group.

Assignment:
Rate (and discuss) your ability to be a self-directing learner who is capable of establishing your own learning objectives and learning on your own. What materials and activities do you find to be very helpful in assisting you as a self-directing learner?

2) Read and respond to emails that you receive from other members of your Learning Group. Using your response, try and help the other members of your group better understand how they are approaching their own self-directed learning.

3) Reflect on this activity – especially the feedback you receive from the members of your Learning Group. Prepare an entry for your Online Journal that captures some of the important aspects of your reflection.
### Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Recipient of Evaluation Results</th>
<th>Program Element to be Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Agency/Sponsor/Community (Summative Assessment)</td>
<td>X Inputs (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Assessment</td>
<td>Instructor/Developer (Formative Evaluation)</td>
<td>X Processes (Organizational Efforts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Evaluation</td>
<td>Learners (Empowering Evaluation)</td>
<td>Products (Organizational Results)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
| | | | |

#### How will data be used?

To decide if the Local Learning Program should be changed to include the regular use of the **Question & Answer Conference Call**. The Conference Call will be adopted if all statements receive a mean score of 3.8 or greater.

---

Local Learning Program Evaluation

Thank you for participating in last week’s **Question & Answer Conference Call** for Unit 2 of our Local Learning Program. Please take a few minutes and indicate how much you agree/disagree with each of the following statements. Your responses will help us understand whether a **Question & Answer Conference Call** should become a regular feature of future programs.

1) **The Question & Answer Conference Call was a good use of my time.**
   
   Strongly Agree  5  4  3  2  1  Strongly Disagree

2) **My questions/concerns were answered during the Question & Answer Conference Call.**
   
   Strongly Agree  5  4  3  2  1  Strongly Disagree

3) **Everyone had a good chance to participate during the Question & Answer Conference Call.**
   
   Strongly Agree  5  4  3  2  1  Strongly Disagree

4) **It was important to have a good facilitator during the Question & Answer Conference Call.**
   
   Strongly Agree  5  4  3  2  1  Strongly Disagree

5) **Comments:**