CHAPTER-II
Theoretical Foundations
"The most lasting use of evaluation... is... the process itself by which we can foster attitudes and processes that are the heart of excellence in teaching."

Bachman (1990): 137
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM EVALUATION

2.0 Introduction

This chapter seeks to record theoretical foundations of curriculum evaluations. First of all, meanings and definitions of syllabus and curriculum are stated. The two terms are very often used as synonyms in the present research. This is followed by a detailed discussion on the dimensions in curriculum development, in which Tylerian approach to curriculum development are elaborated. Next, the chapter deals with models of curriculum evaluation and finally, various aspects of evaluation including the problem of standards in evaluation are delineated. All this taken together serves as guidelines for the evaluation of the curriculum taken up for the present research.

2.1 Syllabus and Curriculum: Meaning and Definitions

The term 'curriculum' has been variously defined by the educationists. Inspite of the fact that the term 'curriculum' is described quite philosophically, the common tendency to this day is to equate it with the syllabus, a scheme of work, or a course
of study. In the literature of curriculum studies, the terms 'sylabus' and 'curriculum' are very often used as synonyms. In North America and elsewhere, the terms 'course of study', 'curriculum', 'programme' and 'sylabus' usually cover more or less the same ground and therefore, very frequently used interchangeably. Robertson (1975:564) says:

A curriculum includes goals, objectives, contents, processes, resources and means of evaluation of all the learning experiences planned for pupils both in and outside the school community through classroom instructions and related programmes, while a syllabus is a statement of the plan for any part of the curriculum excluding the element curriculum evaluation itself.

A syllabus can be compared to a blue print, it is the plan which the teacher converts into a reality of classroom instruction. Nunan comparing the two, says:

"... curriculum is concerned with planning, implementation, evaluation, management and administration of educational programmes. Syllabus, on the other hand, focusses more narrowly on the selection and gradation of contents" (Nunan, 1989:67)

There are two conflicting views expressed about the nature of a syllabus. A syllabus, if considered only as a 'statement' or 'specification of content' reflects a rather narrow point of
A broader view of syllabus design is that it cannot be independent of methodological aspects. This means that syllabus and methodology are inter-related. The present research work endorses this broad canvas for syllabus evaluation.

Taba (1962:12) views at least 7 important points which constitute a curriculum. These points include:

1. diagnosing educational needs;
2. formulating objectives;
3. selection of contents;
4. organization of content;
5. selection of learning experiences;
6. organization of learning experiences, and
7. determining the ways and means of evaluating effectiveness of what is taught.

Obviously, this is a very comprehensive definition of the domain of curriculum development, which encompasses questions of learning methods and instructional techniques as well as those of educational measurement.

Gagney (1965) provides a narrower definition of the curriculum in which he tries to establish relation of learning to the selection and organization of content. He puts forward his ideas framed in question forms such as:

1. Does a particular item of content at some point in a curriculum facilitate learning or slow it up?
2. Is there a sequence of curricular elements that promotes learning more than some other sequence does? and how can one find it out?

By content, Gagney refers to not only the "printed page of text," "Chapter heading," "oral instruction of teacher" but also to the "goals of instruction". He states,

... content must reflect goals that are independent of the media of instruction, whether these are the communications of a teacher, a textbook, or a television set. If the goals of instruction are involved in the content, these must also be tied to the student's behaviour, or perhaps to his expected behaviour. These considerations lead to the idea that content needs to be stated as objectives and that these objectives mean things that the student is able to accomplish. More specifically, content may be defined as descriptions of the expected capabilities of students in specified domains of human activity (Gagney, 1965).

The foregoing descriptions specify what the students are expected to achieve by the end of the course.

Defining objectives of an educational planning and the measurement of achievement have been emphasised by Tyler (1959) and Bloom et al (1956). The most fundamental reason for the central importance of defining educational objectives is that such definition makes it possible to discern the basic distinction between content and method. It is the defining of
objectives that brings an essential clarity into the area of curriculum design.

According to Gagney, the concept of curriculum is a combination of the idea of a unit of content with the idea of prerequisites. He defines curriculum as:

... a sequence of content units arranged in such a way that the learning of each unit may be accomplished as a single act, provided the capabilities described by specified prior units (in the sequence) have already been mastered by the learner.

It is evident from this definition that a curriculum may be of any length, that is, it may contain any number of units. A curriculum is specified when (1) the terminal objectives are stated; (2) the sequence of pre-requisite capabilities is described; and (3) the initial capabilities assumed to be possessed by the students are identified.

Keeping in view the foregoing views of Gagney, it can be posited that determining the content and sequence of a curriculum can be based upon a rational analysis. What one really wants to know about a given curriculum is whether it works. One is interested in finding out whether learning is promoted by presentation of particular content in a particular sequence.
Furthermore, there is no short-cut method to evaluate the effectiveness of a curriculum. One must actually put the curriculum into use, and then measure the results in terms of student achievement, or of some other specified criterion.

Gagney reiterates that the design of a curriculum, by which he means the appropriate sequencing of units of content, should be based upon empirical evidences. It does not have to be a matter of speculation about what students are capable of learning, on the one hand, nor a matter of elegance of logical derivation on the other. The pedagogical correctness of content units can be tested by successively applied trials of what students can actually achieve. It should be well-borne in mind that curriculum development is a continuous process rather than a discrete, one-shot affair. Curriculum design should be firmly based on the kind of empirical evidence that comes from successive trials and systematic testing.

2.1.1 Summing Up

Curriculum evaluation is regarded as a highly serious and enormous task. In the past three decades, various educationists concerned with educational testing and evaluation have developed
evaluation strategies suitable for specific purposes. However, the methods commonly applied in student-oriented evaluation will have to be adapted to suit the programme-oriented evaluation. Educationists like Tyler (1949), Gagney (1965), and Scriven (1967/1991) in the United States have attempted to sort out a number of important concepts which can be considered as "building blocks" in the development of programme evaluation.

Scriven (1991) prefers to call curriculum as "educational instrument". There are processes, personnel, procedures, programmes and the like that are operative when formal educational activities take place. This means that the curriculum is not viewed in abstract. Interactions take place. Content units, teachers and the teaching environment are principal factors which interact when a curriculum is enacted. If content units are not to be evaluated in an abstract way, many other interactions come into play. Evaluation of such a programme means a situation which is dynamic and creative. Hence, Scriven's use of the expression "educational instruments" is suggestive of a highly realistic situation. At the same time, methodological problems with respect to curriculum evaluation become difficult because of the involvement of teachers, students and a teaching environment which are idiosyncratic.
2.2 Choice of Evaluation Strategies

Choice of strategies in educational evaluation can be arrived at after Scriven's attempts of making differentiations between evaluation goals and evaluation roles, formative versus summative evaluation and intrinsic versus pay-off evaluation. Evaluation goals are attempts to answer certain types of questions with regard to educational instruments. Commonly these questions concern with the degree to which one instrument performs better than the other, or how well the instrument performs with regard to specified criteria.

Evaluation roles are quite diverse. For example, one role might be able to contribute to the process of development of a curriculum or to the self-improvement of a teacher. On the other hand, the evaluation role might be aimed primarily at the determination of the over-all quality of an educational instrument.

Perhaps the best way to examine and illustrate evaluation roles is to subdivide them in terms of formative evaluation and summative evaluation. Scriven describes formative evaluation as evaluation used to improve a curriculum during its development. It is an evaluation which takes place at an intermediate stage of
curriculum development and permits intelligent changes to be made in the curriculum. The deficiencies and strengths of intermediate versions of the curriculum are identified and appropriate adjustments are made.

Summative evaluation is a final evaluation of a teaching instrument. An effort is made to obtain some kind of terminal or overall evaluation in order that some type of general conclusion can be made. Based on such conclusions, decisions need to be taken with regard to the replacement of one curriculum by another and the acceptance or rejection of such elements as textbooks, courses of study and the like.

The lines of differentiation between formative and summative evaluation are less clear than they appear on the surface. For example, one might assume that formative evaluation is basically in-house evaluation conducted by those whose primary task is the development of a curriculum. In contrast, summative evaluation might be thought of as evaluation by the outsiders not directly involved in the development of the curriculum. It can be argued, nevertheless, that formative evaluation is a kind of intermediate summative evaluation.
Scriven's (1991) concept of intrinsic evaluation is the appraisal of the teaching instrument itself, more or less in the abstract. Examination is made of the specific features of the educational instrument such as content, goals, teacher attitude etc., and the criteria used are related to the instrument itself. In contrast, pay-off evaluation is a study of the effects of the educational instruments on the students. In each type, however, the evaluation role may be formative or summative depending upon needs and situation.

2.3 Dimensions in Curriculum Development

In his classic monograph entitled Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Tyler (1949) considers evaluation as an integral part of curriculum development. He states his firm belief that educators must clarify and validate their objectives. Then they should go on to develop experiences to help students attain those objectives. Finally, they must continually evaluate students' progress in their achievement of objectives. The Tyler model has been widely used in many of the large scale curriculum development projects and still remains a widely respected and extensively used process to develop, review and revise curricula at all levels of education.
Tyler has stated four divisions of curriculum enquiry in question form as given below:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? (clarification of purpose)
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? (selection of learning experiences)
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? (organization of learning experiences)
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (assessment of progress towards the attainment of the school's objectives).

2.4 Checklist for Objectives

On decision of objectives, Tyler recommends three useful sources for getting information:

1. studies of the learner;
2. studies of contemporary life; and
3. suggestions from subject specialists.

Philosophy of education and theories of learning should act as screening processes for selection and elimination of possible objectives obtained from the above mentioned three sources. He views that in connection with investigations of curriculum objectives, the paramount importance should be paid to the conceptions of the learner and of knowledge and to the problem of
the level of generality. It is important in curriculum development to examine the concept of the learner as an active, purposeful human being, seeking to learn by discovery. Tyler suggests that the idea of discovery learning or Whitehead's comment that "knowledge is like fish, it must be caught fresh each day," takes on more meaning to curriculum designers.

A related issue is the question of the structure of a discipline. Tyler observes: "Some programmed materials operate on the assumption that the knowledge to be learnt is not primarily an organized system. However, the learners can understand the structure of the discipline, i.e., the question it deals with, the kind of answers it seeks, the concepts it uses to analyze the field, the methods it uses to obtain data, and the way it organizes its inquiries and findings. When they gain this understanding of the structure, they learn more effectively and efficiently the content involved in it."

The level of generality appropriate for an objective has been a puzzling question to the curriculum designers. Empirical investigations made on children's ability to generalize manifests that the majority of children show a low level of accurate generalization. The argument for generality is to help the students perceive and use a generalized mode of behaviour. It is assumed
that they should be able to move easily from the general to the specific, and vice-versa. The level of generality of the objective should be stated in the curriculum plan, with specific details used as illustrations, rather than treating the specifics as ends in themselves.

2.5 Conditions for Effective Learning

In order to provide guidance to the curriculum framers on devising learning experiences, Tyler sets 10 conditions for effective learning as given below:

1. The learner must have experiences that give him an opportunity to practice the kind of behavior implied by the objective.

2. The learning experiences must be such that the learner obtains satisfaction from carrying on the kind of behavior implied by the objective.

3. The motivation of the learner, that is, the impelling force for his own active involvement, is an important condition.

4. Another condition is that the learner finds his previous ways of reacting unsatisfactory, so that he is stimulated to try new ways.

5. The learner should have some guidance in trying to carry on the new behavior he is to learn.

6. The learner should have ample and appropriate materials on which to work.
7. The learner should have time to carry on the behaviour, to practice it until it has become part of his repertoire.

8. The learner should have opportunity for a good deal of sequential practice. Here repetition is inadequate and quickly becomes ineffective.

9. Another condition is for each learner to set standards for himself that require him to go beyond his performance, but standards that are attainable.

10. The tenth condition is that to continue learning beyond the time when a teacher is available, the learner must have means of judging his performance to be able to tell how well he is doing. Without these means, his standards are of no utility.

Concerning problems of guiding the learner in carrying on the desired behaviour, Tyler observes that students commonly follow their teachers' behaviour as a model to direct their own behaviour. This is a useful guide if the teacher frequently demonstrates the behaviour the students are expected to acquire, but all the teachers do not furnish an observable model of the desired learning. Often when students cannot gain a clear picture of what they are to do by observing the teacher, they depend upon other students. It is a proven fact that clear observable models are useful ways of guiding the desired behaviour. This guidance of learning of the student includes helping him to focus his attention on those aspects of the total situation that enable him to control it and carry it on successfully.
In this connection, peer groups exert a powerful influence on the things that are learnt, the efforts made and the satisfaction obtained. Some peer groups enhance the work of teachers, some insulate the students from the influence of the faculty, and others partially counteract the efforts of teachers. In planning and developing the instructional programme, peer groups should be considered and steps taken to utilise their influences.

As children and young people grow up, they often find persons who seem particularly attractive and seek to emulate them. The young child may begin this process of identification with his mother, following her around the house and attempting to imitate her behaviour. During the years of development, other persons in turn are objects of identification. This process is one of the ways in which the young people learn, and with a variety of constructive personalities available around, the outcomes are positive and include the acquisition of attitudes, values and interests, as well as skills and practices. In some schools, however, the range of constructive personalities that are close enough to the students to permit attraction and emulation is too narrow, so that many children find no one on the faculty enough like them to be drawn into identification. This is another
consideration for instructional planning that should seek to use all important resources for learning that can be provided.

2.6 The Keypoints in Tyler's Rationale for Curriculum Development

Tyler's rationale for curriculum development can be presented as key-points:

1. clarification of purpose;
2. selection of learning experiences;
3. the organization of learning experiences; and
4. assessment of progress toward the attainment of the school's objectives.

The objectives of a programme, in Tyler's views, should be clarified through studies of the learner and studies of contemporary life. These objectives should be screened through the school's philosophy of education theories of learning and suggestions from subject matter specialists. The objectives should be written at the level of general principles, using specific learning outcomes as illustrations of the objective's intent. Learning experiences at a minimum should provide opportunities to practise the behaviours the programme is seeking to develop. It should be satisfying and feasible; it should be varied in terms of the methods employed and provide continuous evaluation feedback to the teacher and learner.
2.6.1 Critique

The Tylerian rationale for curriculum development has been recently criticised as being used predominantly as a recipe; they were often followed as a stepwise formula for curriculum development. The Tylerian model/approach does not take into account unintended effects of the (hidden) curriculum, it does not look at process variables or examination of the particular instructional setting. Moreover, the Tylerian approach seems to be immune to the learner variables which may be present prior to implementation of the curriculum.

Taba (1962) has made influential variations on the Tyler rationale. She expanded the stepwise interpretation into seven phases:

a) diagnosis of needs,
b) formulation of objectives,
c) selection of content,
d) organization of contents,
e) selection of learning experiences,
f) organization of learning experiences, and
g) determination of what and how to evaluate.

Goodlad (1979) introduced the notion "learning opportunities" to replace Tyler's "learning experiences" as a more tangible category, and set Tyler's categories in a larger
context, suggesting that each of these categories can be treated at instructional, institutional, societal, ideological and individual levels.

Walker (1971) provides a conceptual alternative, drawing upon naturalistic study of curriculum decision-making committees. He argues that curriculum committees rarely follow the Tylerian model. Instead, they operate much more politically. They begin with a platform, or set of beliefs, background knowledge, prejudices, hidden agendas, images of what might be, and so on. These all became a formidable part of deliberation or discussion and negotiation in the second phase. In the final phase, design, is realised when time constraints mandate that proposed practices be implemented, often regardless of logical closure.

Schawab (1973) argues that a conception of curriculum consistent with practical inquiry invokes four fundamental commonplaces: teachers, learners, subject matter, and milieu or environment. The curriculum that has an impact on the outlook of students is derived from the composite of interactions among the commonplaces.

Berman (1968) offers a set of curricular priorities as alternatives to the conventional subject matter areas. She
argues that the curriculum should focus directly on processes such as perceiving, communicating, knowing, decision making, patterning, creating and valuing. She also suggests that it is possible to integrate these processes with each of the conventional content areas.

2.6.2 Conclusion

Defining dimensions of curriculum is one of the most widely accepted paradigms of curriculum inquiry. The dimensions guide in conceptualizations of curriculum development. The Tylerian guidelines or rationale, despite its criticism of being incompatible in some cases, is still the most widely used set of principles in curriculum today. It has great potential for enabling a form of internal critique which enriches inquiry in curriculum studies. For details of this impact on the present curriculum in focus see, 2.17.

2.7 Models of Curriculum Evaluation

A curriculum is the medium through which instruction is planned and delivered, and curriculum evaluation itself is a major category of educational evaluation. An examination of the curriculum is also likely to be significant component of
evaluations of educational materials and practices, educational programmes and educational organisations. The term 'curriculum evaluation' has been used to refer to several different but interrelated concepts which have not always been distinguished in the research literature. Alkin (1990) says, that some writers have used 'curriculum evaluation' to refer to curriculum product evaluation; others have thought of curriculum programme evaluation. In the field of curriculum evaluation these two differing concepts have served as two different models to the evaluators. They are described below:

2.7.1. Curriculum Product Evaluation

This is the kind of evaluation that focuses on products such as courses of study, syllabi, textbooks and makes evaluation judgments about these products. Furthermore, one type of curriculum product evaluation employs specified external criteria. Curriculum evaluation, in this sense, is an examination of the adequacy of curriculum product based on desired characteristics describing appropriateness.

The example of curriculum product evaluation can best be seen in the work of Tyler (1976). His evaluation judges
characteristics such as: adequacy of the teacher's manual for classroom application and for providing explanation as to the content selection, sequence and presentation, effectiveness of the curriculum materials, specification of instructional objectives on which the material is based; the appropriateness of the materials to the given skills; background knowledge, age, ethnicity and socio-economic background of the intended students.

McNeil et al (1980) discuss five general criteria for evaluating the quality of instructional materials used as classroom reading matter; consistency with reading approach; adequacy of objectives; instructional content; instructional methodology, and validation.

A second type of curriculum product evaluation differs in several respects; primarily in its reliance on field data for judgments of the adequacy of the curriculum product, curricular products are evaluated in terms of their actual impact on students. In this sense, curriculum product evaluation is an examination, or a validation, of the impact of a newly developed product. The evaluation theory for this type is primarily found in the evaluation portions of the literature on curriculum and instructional product development procedures.
Curriculum product evaluation based on the field data may be performed both formatively to shape and modify the curriculum or summatively to validate the curriculum. The focus of curriculum product evaluation would be typically on learning materials and would not include broader examples of curriculum products such as comprehensive school programme.

2.7.2. Curriculum Programme Evaluation

Another major type of curriculum evaluation theory consists of the evaluation of curriculum programmes in operation. The term 'curriculum programme evaluation' refers to the complex set of interactions between a given instructional programme and its setting. Curriculum evaluation activities in this broader context are concerned with looking at how a particular curriculum works within its instructional setting.

The discussion of curriculum programme evaluation theory models overlaps with the discussion of programme evaluation in general terms. In some respects, this type of evaluation might be viewed as programme evaluation rather than curriculum evaluation since it is not the curriculum per se that is being looked at but curriculum viewed as a part of an operating programme in situ.
The theories associated with curriculum programme evaluation have been further differentiated into several sub-sets like: measurement outcome-oriented; research-oriented; value-oriented; and decision-oriented sets. These approaches have been derived within the context of programme evaluation. However, Alkin (1990) views that they might also be appropriately applicable in various aspects of product evaluation. Curriculum evaluation leads to an examination of other sub-sets. These sets would include details of various course syllabuses besides the ones mentioned earlier. The course outlines or syllabuses are realised in the form of textbooks for teaching and particularly so in the area of language teaching. Thus it becomes imperative to look at the structure of a textbook and its inherent features for its evaluation. Such an evaluation would become an integral part of curriculum evaluation.

2.8 Textbook Analysis

The approach to textbook analysis has been dominated by the use of readability formulas propounded by Klare (1982). These formulas yield an index which makes it possible to match the reading demands of a textbook with the reading capabilities of the reader, determined by his reading achievement scores. Two of
the more well-known readability formulas, Dale and Chall (1948) and Fry (1977) use measures of word difficulty and sentence complexity to determine the appropriate reading level of the text.

In addition to readability formulas, a series of checklist instruments have been advocated as a potentially helpful way of analysing textbooks. Jevitz and Meints (1979) show that these checklists direct the textbook analyst to important aspects of the textbooks that are not necessarily measured by readability formulas. These items direct the reader to consider such aspects of the textbook as the use of visual aids, cultural and sex biases, teacher's manual, the quality of workmanship and the quality of materials, cost and the quality of writing to name a few.

Current theories suggest that learning from textbooks is a function of characteristics of the text itself and cognitive strategies used by the reader during reading.

2.9 The Text Material

One factor affecting learning from text is structure. Structure refers to the way ideas are connected together in
Logical organisational patterns. A few basic rhetorical structures appear to reflect fundamental patterns of human thought like simple listing, conclusion, comparison, temporal sequence, cause-effect and problem-solving. These basic structures can be subsumed in higher order structures that underlie particular text genres like narratives and newspaper articles and content areas such as biology, history etc.

Another characteristic of a text that influences learning outcomes is local coherence. Local coherence is achieved by several kinds of simple linguistic links or ties that connect ideas together within and between sentences. Among the most common links are various forms of reference and conjunctions. Research has established the importance of cohesive devices in understanding and recalling the text. Also, children prefer to read, read faster, and have better memory for sentences connected by explicit conjunctions. In short, various features of the text itself — structure, local coherence, content — influence learning from reading characteristics of the reader, however, play even more crucial role in learning from textbooks. Cognitive strategies used by the reader during reading do play an important role.
2.10 Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are comprehension devices students use to get the information from the text into their heads. These information-processing strategies include not only the initial focussing of attention and the subsequent encoding of the information attended to but also an 'executive level' aspect of these processes called metacognition. Metacognition refers to both the awareness and control that readers have over their own thinking and learning (Baker and Brown 1983). Available research results show that several cognitive strategies are associated with learning from text.

2.10.1 Conclusion

A prime reason for analysing textbook is to enable educators to make wise decisions when selecting textbooks for classroom use. The choice of the textbook should also be in consonance with the linguistic competence the learner is expected to achieve. This is clear from the syllabus statement and in particular the objectives as laid down in the syllabus document. Two widely used techniques to achieve this are -- use of readability formulas to index the general language complexity of the textbook and checklist instruments. Both these techniques can be
helpful in deciding in which textbooks are generally appropriate for classroom use. Thus, the textbook analysis has a third dimension besides the two stated earlier which relate to language proficiency the learner should achieve and its practical realisation.

2.11 Curriculum Evaluation: Meaning and Definition

To evaluate something means to adjudge its worth, find out its strengths and weakness and report to the authority of the same. Evaluation of an educational programme is the account of processes adopted in the endeavour supported by statistics and profiles. It tells what happened. It reveals perceptions and judgements that different groups and individual hold as obtained by defined objective means. It tells of merits and shortcomings. It usually offers generalisations for the guidance of subsequent educational programmes.

Curriculum evaluation refers to the process of studying the merit or worth of some aspect, or the whole, of a curriculum. Depending on the way in which the term curriculum is defined, the focus or objects of curriculum evaluation could include curriculum and student needs, curriculum design, instructional
processes, materials used in instruction, objectives for student outcomes, student progress through the curriculum, teacher effectiveness, the learning environments, curriculum policy, resource allotment, and the outcomes of instruction. A curriculum evaluation requires collection, processing and interpretation of data pertaining to an educational programme. For a complete evaluation, there can be two main kinds of data to be collected: 1) Objective descriptions of goals, environments, personnel methods, contents and outcomes and 2) Personal judgment as to the quality and appropriateness of these goals and environments. Obviously, a curriculum evaluator will have to take up a series of tasks and tests for his undertaking. Shedding light on the tasks of an evaluator, Tyler (1967) remarks,

The curriculum evaluator has such diverse tasks as weighing the outcomes of a training institute against previously stated objectives, comparing the costs of two courses of study, collecting judgments of the social worth of a certain goal, and determining the skill or sophistication needed for students commencing a certain scholastic experience. These evaluative efforts should lead to better decision making: to better development, better selection, and better use of curriculum.

In order to arrive at an informed decision of curriculum evaluation, the following definitions provided by eminent educationists in this field may prove helpful:
According to Cronbach, "... we may define 'evaluation' broadly as the collection and use of information to make decision about an educational programme" (Croanbach, 1963:672).

Stufflebean et al. say that: "Educational Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (1971:43).

According to McDonald, "Evaluation is the process of conceiving, obtaining and communicating information for the guidance of educational decision making with regard to a specified programme" (1973:1-3).

In Davies' opinion, "Curriculum evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining and providing information useful for making decisions and judgements about curricula" (1981:49).

All the foregoing definitions of curriculum evaluation have one dominant common point; that curriculum evaluation is a systematic collection of information for educational decisions.

A fair and satisfactory definition of evaluation suitable for the purpose of an educational research such as the one undertaken by the researcher of this present study goes smoothly well with Brown (1989). He says,
Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of the curriculum, and assess its effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the participants' attitudes within a context of particular institutions involved. (Brown, 1989:223).

2.12 Purposes of Evaluation

There can be at least two chief purposes of any evaluation, evaluation for the purposes of accountability and evaluation for the purposes of programme development. In general, accountability refers to the answerability of staff to others for the quality of their work. Whole accountability-oriented evaluation is summative in nature as it is intended to assess the degree to which staff have met their professional accountability demands, development-oriented evaluation is intended to bring about programme improvement and will normally be formative in nature. It regards the programme as fluid and seeks ways to better it. (Morris and Fitz-Gibbon, 1978:24).

Formative evaluators aim to ensure that the program be implemented as effectively as possible. The formative evaluator watches over this program, alert both for problems and good ideas that can be shared (Morris and Fitz-Gibbon 1978:24).
In fact, much of the evaluation is formative as it is conducted during the course to facilitate improvement, summative test and questionnaire data are also generated at the end of the course. These data are used summatively to examine the value of the course from bureaucratic perspectives. As such, labelling evaluation data as formative or summative must relate closely to the purpose for which it has been collected. Where data are used to influence change, it is formative. Data can serve both formative and summative purposes in both developmental and accountability-oriented evaluation.

As the developmental-oriented evaluation is intended to improve the educational quality of a programme (curriculum in the context of the present research), it is guided by the intrinsic concerns of the insiders; by the identification of strengths which can be built upon as well as by the identification of obstacles to progress and the introduction of more effective means to achieve desired objectives. A more comprehensive and broader approach to evaluation would encompass both the accountability and development dimensions. Such an evaluation would not only measure educational products but also help to throw light on the reasons why things are turning out the way
they are. A broader approach to evaluation would integrate the evaluation into the whole life-cycle of the project.

Evaluation is the crucial element for success in all stages of a project's life. The process of active monitoring (evaluation during the implementation stage), could be of great benefit to both staff and project as it would maintain and develop staff awareness of goals and objectives (Brown 1989).

Delineating the need for curriculum evaluation, Sanders (1990) states that knowing about the quality of curriculum is a concern that extends beyond the local schools to the state at large. Education prepares future generations to take their place in society and neither educators nor other members of society can afford to retain substandard educational goals, materials, or instruction. Curriculum evaluation that monitors and supports on the quality of education serves educational policy makers and those who must make decisions that affect the education system at different levels. It contributes to public relations and aids planning. Curriculum evaluation of this type is called summative evaluation.

Identifying aspects of a local curriculum which can be improved and then guiding decisions about how to improve them is another role of curriculum evaluation. Professional educators
concern themselves with changing curriculum content, teaching methods, educational facilities, staff selection and development, and objectives for student outcomes as need of their student and society are identified. This calls for a continual process of local curriculum study and improvement by school personnel. Curriculum evaluation of this type is called formative evaluation.

The first role of curriculum evaluation serves the needs of policy makers, administrators, and other members of society for information about the educational system that will help them to make important decisions affecting curriculum. The second role of curriculum evaluation serves the needs of teachers, curriculum specialists, school administrators and others who are responsible for curriculum development.

2.13 Aspects of Evaluation

An evaluation is serious and systematic attempt to discover strengths and weaknesses of a programme. It is guided by certain principles, principles of systematicity and comprehensiveness. Weir and Roberts (1994) provide exhaustive details on the aspects of evaluation, put in 6 wh-words as why, when, how long, what, who and how.
For the purpose of the present research, they merit exploration in some length. The first aspect of any evaluation concerns the purpose of undertaking any research or project work. A major reason for this can be stated as professional information so that a wider audience can benefit from the educational experience. It would make a wide range of information to help and inform others interested and involved in the same sort of programmes. This would enable them to learn from these experiments and improve upon them. Evaluations of educational programmes can provide important pieces of information. To quote Weir and Roberts (1994) they can provide:

1. evidence which can inform theoretical disputes about directions to be followed in language teaching, or in teacher education or curriculum research, and

2. context-sensitive information on implementation, for example, to indicate whether particular approaches or techniques are suitable under given conditions, whether they meet the claims made for them; whether certain textbooks or materials are appropriate or inappropriate, effective or not for various contexts, purposes, and groups of learners.

Why?

The purposes of evaluation can be summed up in terms of appraisal, monitoring and summative evaluation. The purpose of
appraisal can be seen in assessing the feasibility of a programme before it is started, monitoring concerns to evaluate events during the life-span of the programme, whereas summative evaluation is concerned with the assessment of its worthiness.

When?

As to the 'when' aspect of an evaluation, it is considered highly important to discover appropriate points of time in the life of a programme. Weir and Roberts (1994), laying emphasis on the continuity of evaluation opine that:

... systematic evaluation throughout a programme for improvement (formative evaluation) should be integrated with summative evaluation." They further view that, "systematic formative evaluation can operate as a form of quality control, the monitoring of progress and the provision of immediately useful information for decision making and change at managerial and staff level.

Evaluation could usefully integrate formative and summative dimensions and be concerned both with the results of a programme as well as an understanding of how these results came about - i.e., with process and activities during implementation as well as with end-products. Formative evaluation during a programme can help those involved to negotiate its directions
with a deeper understanding of its internal and external dynamics. In many ways, the middle period is the most important time to be getting information, as it will enable the members of staff to take any steps necessary in terms of readjustment and to justify their actions to the bureaucracy. If an evaluation is conducted only at the end of a programme, it frequently means that crucial information for the evaluation is no longer available.

How Long?

The duration of an evaluation needs to be considered very carefully at the planning stage. Programmes and projects evolve over period of time. Where the focus is on language improvement, mastery is a slow and incremental process. If an evaluation is to be valid and reliable, and should have credibility with an outside audience and with inside staff, it needs to cover a representative period of time.

What?

The 'what' question is related to the choice of focus on the research programme undertaken. The scope of evaluation can vary
greatly because an educational evaluation may have a number of possible focal points. The object of evaluation, therefore, may include teaching materials, methods of teaching, goals and objectives of a curriculum, students performance or evaluation system itself, to cite a few examples. Sanders (1992:5-6) summarizes the foci as:

1. **Program needs assessment**: to establish goals and objectives.

2. **Individual needs assessment**: to provide insights about the instructional needs of individual learners.

3. **Resource allotment**: to provide guidance in setting priorities for budgeting.

4. **Process or strategies for providing services to learners**: to provide insights about how best to organize a school to facilitate learning.
   
   a. **Curriculum design**: to provide insights about the quality of program planning and organization.

   b. **Classroom processes**: to provide insights about the extent to which educational programmes are being implemented.

   c. **Materials for instruction**: to provide insights about whether specific materials are indeed aiding student learning.
d. Monitoring of pupil progress: to conduct formative (in-progress) evaluations of student learning.

e. Learner motivation: to provide insights about the effectiveness of teachers in aiding students to achieve goals and objectives of the school.

f. Learning environment: to provide insights about the extent to which students are provided with a responsive environment in terms of their educational needs.

g. Staff development: to provide insights about the extent to which the school system provides the staff opportunities to increase their effectiveness.

h. Decision making: to provide insights about how well a school staff - principals, teachers and others - make decisions that result in learner benefits.

5. Outcomes of instruction: to provide insights about the extent to which students are achieving the goals and objectives set for them.

The foregoing taxonomies of potential focal points raise a number of important issues. Sander's list is much broader than generally expected. The scope for an evaluation is not decided in any objective or technical terms. A value decision is always required in order to determine what aspects of a programme are significant, are capable of development, and should be made open to scrutiny. There is, therefore, a great potential for personal and ideological conflict when approaching evaluations. Besides, the methods by which these different foci may be described must
be chosen according to their characteristics as objects of de-
scription and not some ideological commitment to a particular
paradigm of enquiry. The list above is largely framed in terms
of development characterised by formative, educational motivation
for understanding and improvement.

Who?

Obviously, there can be two categories of experts to
evaluate any educational programme, called outsiders and
insiders. Both of them have certain advantages and
disadvantages. It is generally understood that the outsider
specialists possess the expertise to conduct an evaluation of an
ELT programme. Weir and Roberts (1994, state,

Many training courses have been specifically
developed to prepare personnel to shoulder the
responsibilities of syllabus design, test-
preparation, material production, teacher
training. However, parallel preparation for
the role of evaluation in curriculum planning
and development has been conspicuous by its
absence from many university and college
calendars.

It is considered that outsiders have no vested interest and are
more objective than insiders. But the outsiders cannot function
all by themselves. Questions like - Can outsiders evaluate
effectively without the cooperation and collaboration of insider staff? - poses serious doubts. Besides, it is doubtful that they can understand the full complexity of an educational programme in their short visits. Insiders have far greater experience of the situation; they are aware of the history behind developments. In particular, they understand the human predispositions and relationships that affect implementation of an educational programme. Keeping these views in mind, an ideal situation for an evaluation would be forming an acceptable mixed group representing both outsiders and insiders. This would provide better perspectives and contributions to the objectives of evaluation in ELT.

How?

The 'how' aspect of evaluation is determined by the type of evaluation to be undertaken. In case of summative evaluation, test results, and their statistical analysis are heavily relied upon. In case of formative evaluation, meant for developmental purposes, there are three key evaluation methods, interview, questionnaire and observation. Formative evaluation has both product and process dimensions. The product lies in practical curriculum improvement, the process in teachers' related profes-
sional development. The link between curriculum development and teacher development is regarded as an established fact now. Villiamy and Webb view that:

Formative evaluation can support teacher development as it can promote the revised and deepened perception of classroom realities obtained through monitoring and it can develop a better understanding of pedagogic issues and problems (Valliamy and Webb 1992).

Methods for formative, insider-led evaluation, are designed to explore issues and problems, monitor classroom events and assess the relative success of teaching remedies that have been adopted. They should be informative, useful, accessible, economic, flexible and as explicit and systematic as possible. For details of the impact of these aspects of evaluation on the present study, see 2.17.

2.14 Standards in Evaluation

In general, criteria to be applied for evaluation should be objective so that they are universally acceptable. However, some may reflect our ideological stance. Objective criteria are endorsed by Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1987:13-14). They remark:
The critical characteristic of any evaluation study is that it provides the best possible information that could have been collected under the circumstances and that the information meet the credibility requirements of its evaluation audience.

In order to develop and control the quality of evaluation, an attempt was made in the United States under the auspices of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation in 1981. Stufflebeam (1990) has summarised those standards, grouped under 4 headings; utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy. The following table summarised in Stufflebeam (1990) provides clear and comprehensive picture of the same:

Table No.1

Summary of the Standards

(A) Utility Standards

The utility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the practical information needs of given audiences. These standards are:

(A1) Audience Identification

Audiences involved in or affected by the evaluation should be identified, so that their needs can be addressed.
(A2) Evaluator Credibility
The person conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation, so that their findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.

(A3) Information Scope and Selection
Information collected should be of such scope and selected in such ways as to address pertinent questions about the object of the evaluation and be responsive to the needs and interests of specified audiences.

(A4) Valuation Interpretation
The perspectives, procedures, and rationale used to interpret the findings should be carefully described, so that the bases for value judgments are clear.

(A5) Report Clarity
The evaluation report should describe the object being evaluated and its context, and the purposes, procedures, and findings of the evaluation, so that the audiences will readily understand what was done, why it was done, what information was obtained, what conclusions were drawn, and what recommendations were made.

(A6) Report Dissemination
Evaluation findings should be disseminated to clients and other right-to-know audiences, so that they can assess and use the findings.

(A7) Report Timeliness
Release of reports should be timely, so that audiences can best use the reported information.

(A8) Evaluation Impact
Evaluations should be planned and conducted in ways that encourage follow-through by members of the audiences.

B. Feasibility Standards
The feasibility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. These standards are:
(B1) Practical Procedures
The evaluation procedures should be practical, so that disruption is kept to a minimum, and that needed information can be obtained.

(B2) Political Viability
The evaluation should be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups, so that their cooperation may be obtained, and so that possible attempts by any of these groups to curtail evaluation operations or to bias or misapply the results can be averted or counteracted.

(B3) Cost Effectiveness
The evaluation should produce information of sufficient value to justify the resources expended.

C. Propriety Standards

The propriety standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results. These standards are:

(C1) Formal Obligation
Obligations of the formal parties to an evaluation (what is to be done, how, by whom, when) should be agreed to in writing, so that these parties are obligated to adhere to all conditions of the agreement or formally to renegotiate it.

(C2) Conflict of Interest
Conflict of interest, frequently unavoidable, should be dealt with openly and honestly, so that it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.

(C3) Full and Frank Disclosure
Oral and written evaluation reports should be open, direct, and honest in their disclosure of pertinent findings, including the limitations of the evaluation.
(C4) Public's Right to Know
The formal parties to an evaluation should respect and assure the public's right to know, within the limits of other related principles and statutes, such as those dealing with public safety and the right to privacy.

(C5) Rights of Human Subjects
Evaluations should be designed and conducted so that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are respected and protected.

(C6) Human Interactions
Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with an evaluation.

(C7) Balanced Reporting
The evaluation should be complete and fair in its presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.

(C8) Fiscal Responsibility
The evaluator's allocation and expenditure of resources should reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible.

D. Accuracy Standards
The accuracy standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features of the object being studied that determine its worth or merit. These standards are:

(D1) Object Identification
The object of the evaluation (program, project, material) should be sufficiently examined, so that the form(s) of the object being considered in the evaluation can be clearly identified.

(D2) Context Analysis
The context in which the program, project, or material exists should be examined in enough detail, so that its likely influences on the object can be identified.
(D3) Described Purposes and Procedures
The purposes and procedures of the evaluation should be monitored and described in enough detail, so that they can be identified and assessed.

(D4) Defensible Information Sources
The sources of information should be described in enough detail, so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed.

(D5) Valid Measurement
The information-gathering instruments and procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented in ways that will assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the given use.

(D6) Reliable Measurement
The information-gathering instruments and procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented in ways that will assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for the intended use.

(D7) Systematic Data Control
The data collected, processed, and reported in an evaluation should be reviewed and corrected, so that the results of the evaluation will not be flawed.

(D8) Analysis of Quantitative Information
Quantitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations.

(D9) Analysis of Qualitative Information
Qualitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations.

(D10) Justified Conclusions
The conclusions reached in an evaluation should be explicitly justified, so that the audiences can assess them.
Objective Reporting

The evaluation procedures should provide safeguards to protect the evaluation findings and reports against distortion by the personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation.

The foregoing standards, however, cannot be generalised to be universally applicable. These are the standards suited to democratic contexts where there is an ethos of open information. Stufflebeam (1990:95) commenting on these standards, remarks, "The Joint Committee's standards are distinctly American and may not reflect the values, experiences, political realities and practical constraints in some other countries." However, the standards set by the Committee merit attention. Some of the aspects of the foregoing standards may be debatable, however, these standards do set a benchmark in the field of evaluation in ELT.

Patton (1986) provides a very neat hierarchy of evaluation criteria. He views that the ultimate test of an evaluation is the extent to which it improves educational decisions and leads to action. A look at this hierarchy of evaluation criteria, given below, will be highly useful in this context:
## 2.15 Hierarchy of Evaluation Accountability: Evaluating Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>To what extent and in what ways was the programme improved? To what extent were informed, high-quality decisions made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To what extent did the intended use occur? Were recommendations implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What did the intended users learn? How were users' attitudes and ideas affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What do stakeholders think about the evaluation? What's the evaluation's credibility? relevance? accuracy? potential utility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Who was involved? To what extent were the key stakeholders and primary decision makers involved throughout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What data were gathered? What was the focus, the design, the analysis? What happened in the evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To what extent were resources for the evaluation sufficient and well managed? Was time sufficient?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Patton 1986:173)
Patton (1986:183) further argues,

The information collected should be relevant, understandable, and useful to the stakeholders, and the methods of measurements used should be appropriate to the problem under study. Additionally, the best evaluation practice is also led by principles of ethical propriety, and the constructive integration of insiders and outsiders contributions.

Another set of standards, written from British experiment and framed in Question forms by Harlen and Elliott (1982) given below emphasises the consistency of the evaluation to its purpose, the credibility of evaluators, the integrity of methods, the identification of consequences and the readability of the final report:

2.16 Questions for Reviewing Evaluations
1. Did the evaluation serve to inform the decisions or judgments for which it was originally intended?

2. What decisions have been taken as a consequence of the evaluation?

3. Was the evaluation task interpreted and carried through consistently as intended?
4. Was the information which was gathered appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation?

5. What steps were taken to allow for bias, unrepresentativeness, and low reliability in the information gathered?

6. Were the actual evaluators in the best position to carry out the evaluation?

7. Were the methods used appropriate to the kind of information which was required?

8. Were the methods systematic and explicit?

9. Did those involved in supplying the information approve of the methods used for collecting it?

10. Was there sufficient time allowed in the evaluation for the necessary data to be collected?

11. Was the evaluation carried out at the best time to serve its purpose?

12. What were the side-effects, positive and negative, of the evaluation process?
13. Were satisfactory procedures used to protect the interests of those who supplied information?

14. Were the criteria by which judgement or decisions were made appropriately drawn and explicitly stated?

15. Was the evaluation reported in a way which communicated effectively with the intended audience?

16. What reactions did the report provoke in the participants and in the decision makers?

The foregoing set of standards put in question forms by Harlen & Elliott (1982) can be beneficially used as a checklist for assessing the effectiveness of an evaluation programme in terms of its consistency to the purpose, credibility of the evaluator and integrity of the methods.

To sum up, both objective and also more ideologically based criteria appear in the sets of standards framed by the Joint Committee and Harlen and Elliott respectively. There cannot be a single criteria universally acceptable at all points of time and place. One needs to develop one's own standards for evaluation, according to one's own needs and circumstances. However, one can
substantially profit from attention to the two sets of standards stated above. Stufflebeam (1990), summarising the topic of standards says,

In general, explicit and agreed evaluation standards can serve to help define the scope of evaluations; can bring into the open the ethical aspect to any controversies about evaluation method; can suggest principles to plan evaluations or to tackle evaluation problems; can help judgement of evaluation plans and reports; and, finally, can suggest a framework for training or academic study.

From the foregoing descriptions, it can be concluded that there is no single 'best' or 'correct' method of evaluating any educational programme. The strategies used in any evaluation must represent appropriate and defensible choices from a range of options, not simply the only or the preferred modus operandi of the evaluator. The evaluator should also have a wide repertoire of skills to implement these strategies.

2.17 Application of the Theories used in the Present Study

A curriculum cannot be viewed in abstraction. There are processes, personnel, programmes and the like that are in operation in a curriculum. As discussed in 2.3 curriculum evaluation in the Tylerian model is directly linked to
objectives, selection of contents, organization of learning experiences and learner's progress-assessment. The present study seeks to capitalise on Tylerian model for curriculum evaluation.

The researcher intends to look into the educational objectives as expounded in the checklist for objectives in 2.4. The checklist specifies 3 major sources for getting information as learner's needs societal needs and subject specialist's opinions. The questionnaire set for the present research has taken care of these (see Appendix VI).

Scriven's (1991) concept of formative and summative evaluation has been used, specially the concept of formative evaluation (which is accepted as the 'real' purpose of evaluation) has been highlighted. The present research exploits the two models of curriculum evaluation viz., 'product' and 'programme' both the models as discussed in 2.7.

The textbooks prescribed by the HSEB have been analysed in tune with the readability criteria propounded by Klare (1982) as discussed in length in 2.9. The questionnaire framed for the present study incorporates some major focuses such as student needs, instructional processes, materials used in the instruction, teacher effectiveness and needs for training. The
evaluation system at the HSEB has been scrutinized on the principles of curriculum evaluation set by Roberts (1994). He specifies the aspects of evaluation, highlighting its purpose, time, duration, subject matter, person and methods as discussed in 2.14 and 2.15.

Lastly, the issue of standards in evaluation, the objective criteria endorsed by Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1987), Stufflebeam (1990), Patton (1986) has been capitalized in the present study (see Chapter III 3.4.2.3, 3.4.3, 3.4.3.1, and also Appendix VI for details).

2.18 Summary of the Chapter

The chapter seeks to establish a framework for the evaluation study by underpinning the theoretical foundations in the field of curriculum evaluation. The terms curriculum and syllabus have been used synonymously in the study. Meanings and definitions of the terms have been given followed by a detailed description as the dimensions in the curriculum development. This follows the two models - product and process models of curriculum evaluation. Finally, a summary of curriculum evaluation is given, dealing with its meaning and definitions.
purposes of evaluation, aspects of evaluation and standards in evaluation. The next chapter deals with the Methological aspects of the present research work.
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