Figure 2.7 Killion's Evaluation Framework Components

Program Goals	*Measurable Objectives*	*Information/Data Needed*	*Data Sources*	*Data Collection*	*Data Analysis*	*Time Line*	*Location*
What does the program intend to accomplish?	What changes are anticipated for students? To what degree? What changes are anticipated for educators? To what degree?	What is the best way to determine whether the change has occurred? What information will tell us that?	What/who is the best source of information about the intended change? What is already available? What might have to be created to gather the information needed?	How will the data be collected?	How will the data be examined to determine whether change did occur? Will descriptive or inferential statistics be needed?	When will data be collected?	Where will data be collected?

Source: Killion, 2008. Copyright © 2008 Corwin. Used with permission.

Program Goals

A clear statement of the goals for the program that is being evaluated needs to be stated. What change is expected as a result of educators using the new program as intended? Will student learning increase, will student behaviors improve, will higher-level questions be answered correctly by more students—especially special education students? Will teacher classroom practices change? Is that change expected by all staff or all reading teachers? Does the goal require comparing results to earlier outcomes? More consistent student engagement in mathematics classrooms implies that there is baseline data describing the current level of student engagement.

Measurable Objectives

Measurable objectives establish clear outcomes for student learning as well as clear outcomes for teacher learning and implementation. Stating them using a SMART goal format is useful. A SMART goal is **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**ttainable, **R**esults-oriented, and **T**ime-bound. An example of a SMART goal is, "In three years, all eighth-grade students will improve 15% in the mastery level or better in mathematics functions and algebraic thinking as measured by the district's benchmark assessment."

This goal is specific because it indicates the focus is on eighth-grade students in the area of functions and algebraic thinking. It is measurable because it states evidence from the district benchmark will be used to determine whether the goal has been met. It is attainable because the result is expected within three years. It is results-oriented because it states an increase of 15% in a specific area of mathematics instruction—functions and algebraic thinking. Finally, it is time-bound because three years are allowed for this outcome to occur.

A SMART goal for educators could be, "In two years, seventh- and eighth-grade mathematics teachers will learn and consistently implement identified instructional strategies* that improve functions and algebraic thinking as measured by an Innovation Configuration map." This goal is specific because it focuses on specific instructional strategies. The asterisk would provide further information by naming and defining the strategies staff will be expected to use. It is measurable though the collection of data defined in an Innovation Configuration map. Whether it is attainable depends on a number of

factors including whether and how math teachers were involved in making this decision. It is results-oriented because it sets an expectation that all mathematics teachers will implement the new strategies, and those behaviors will be observed and evidence will be collected concerning how well they are used in the classroom. The goal is time-bound because the result is expected within two years.

Information or Data Needed

When a SMART goal is written explicitly, the data is already identified. In the examples above, district benchmark assessments focused on functions and algebraic thinking will be used to determine whether the results have been accomplished. For educators, the results from observations using an Innovation Configuration map will be analyzed to determine whether teachers are using new instructional practices with quality in their classrooms.

Data Sources

Data sources include identifying specific instruments, processes for collecting data, and tools. It might also indicate whether a new tool or assessment needs to be developed. Following our example from above, the district benchmark assessment already has items that focus on functions and algebraic thinking, but additional items could be added if possible. An Innovation Configuration map for the instructional strategies would need to be developed unless the provider already has developed the tool or at least has clear descriptions of critical attributes of the practices along with specific definitions of what the practice looks like in operation.

Data Collection

This part of a comprehensive plan indicates how data will be collected including who may be involved. Again, following the example above, the district benchmark assessment includes a clear procedure for administration. Classroom data collection could include evidence gathered by building administrators, district mathematics specialists, instructional coaches, and experienced colleagues from the mathematics department in the school as well as other schools.

Data Analysis

This component of the evaluation plan indicates how the data will be analyzed. In the case of student learning data, there would be a comparison between the first or baseline district assessment results with the most current results to determine whether there was a 15% increase in the number of students who reached the mastery level.

In the case of using an Innovation Configuration map, results are usually aggregated to show the percentage of educators implementing new practices at different levels. Beginning with a baseline observation is helpful to determine the quantity and quality of change of practice.

Timeline

How much data and how frequently this data are collected would be determined in this component of the plan. Using the district benchmark schedule would already determine that timeline. For educator observation, you would have to determine whether instructional observation data will be collected monthly, biweekly, or every quarter. Creating the schedule and assignments for classroom observation and data collection would become a critical part of this component especially if it involved district personnel and educators from other schools.

Location

This component explains where the data will be collected. In the continuing example, student data are collected in the classroom through the district benchmark assessment. For educators, the data are also collected in the classroom through a structured observation using an Innovation Configuration map.

The purpose of the evaluation plan is to ensure that a comprehensive data collection system has been defined early in the process. The plan's framework details the tasks, timeline, personnel, and tools required to complete the evaluation. The plan is created before formal professional learning occurs to ensure that data are available and collected systematically. More than one district or school has found that if they wait until the *end* of a project or program to think about evaluation, they cannot go back and collect the data they need to objectively assess the program's effectiveness, merit, or worth.

Making decisions before introducing an initiative is a proactive step to ensure you have the evidence you need to show that the school or district's professional learning efforts are making a difference to students.

Use Evaluation Results to Improve Professional Learning

An important use of evaluation results is to improve professional learning strategies, learning designs, support systems, and educator results. One of the underlying assumptions of professional learning is that when educators learn and use new knowledge and strategies in the classroom, then student learning should improve. The knowledge and use of new strategies and practices should be evidence based to demonstrate that their use has made a difference in student learning or other desired outcomes.

One district's evaluation plan collected and analyzed a program to improve student engagement during instruction. One of the primary strategies was the use of small student learning teams. The teams gave students an opportunity to learn from and with each other, a significant finding from instructional research. Frequent classroom walk-throughs found that students were, in fact, spending a lot of time in small groups.

Yet, a closer look at what was actually happening within those small groups revealed something very different was occurring. High-quality student engagement was defined as all students having the opportunity to participate. Students were assigned roles, yet when observers collected data about student interaction during group time they found that some students barely participated; when they did talk, no one recognized their contributions or commented on their ideas. Further, some groups became dominated by one or two students who did all the work, did most of the talking, and handed out menial tasks to other members, such as picking up materials or cleaning up.

This finer-grained description of effective student learning groups defines high-fidelity or high-quality student learning. Merely being seated in a group setting is not what contributes to a better student learning experience; it is the quality of interaction between students that makes a difference.

In this case, the district built on the foundation that had already been established concerning the use of small learning teams and