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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Any educator who has roamed the aisles of an education convention knows the problem of being confronted with publisher after publisher trying to entice the buyer into purchasing their latest textbook series. The temptation to buy is great especially when "extras" such as charts, duplicating materials or games are included as bonuses for buying "now."

In choosing textbooks to be adopted it is sometimes difficult to know what criteria should be used in making the decision. If that decision is delegated to a committee, then what process do they go through in evaluating the series? After the decision is made, does the committee evaluate their evaluation efforts? Usually not. Looking at the evaluation process and what it entails will show why an evaluation of the evaluation process is important.

Even though the process or act of evaluating is nothing new, evaluation as an educational tool is relatively new and has continued to change in meaning and application. In 1942, evaluation was considered a "new-fangled" term (Woody, 1942) and generally referred to test devices to judge individual achievement (Cronbach, 1963). The definition of evaluation
has developed throughout the years along with the concept of what evaluation should entail. Several authors have stated their own definitions of evaluation, and there are points of agreement and disagreement among all of them (Renzulli, 1972). Many do agree that evaluation implies a judgement (Metfessel, 1967; Stake, 1970), while others such as Tyler (1942) and Niehaus (1968) emphasize evaluation for the sake of change. Other definitions state that the purpose of evaluation is to collect data so that decisions can be made (Cronbach, 1963; Stake, 1963; Stufflebeam, 1967).

For the purpose of this paper, the writer used the following definition of evaluation which expands the concept of evaluation into a process: "Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). This process is a continuous one and may occur on various levels of decision making.

Process, as it is used in the definition of evaluation, is defined as "a particular and continuing activity assuming many methods and involving a number of steps and operations" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Within the educational system, models of evaluation have been developed to attempt to explain how this process works. Such models have been developed by Tyler (1942), Taylor (1967), Metfessel and Michael (1967), Stake (1967), and Stufflebeam et al. (1971). Most of these models try to present a complicated process, such as curriculum evaluation,
in a way that the evaluator can see the relationship among various activities involved in the decision making process.

The fact that there are various models of evaluation pertaining to curriculum points out the need for curriculum evaluation. One of the problems in curriculum evaluation is that there is confusion among those who deal with curriculum as to what curriculum evaluation is and its effects (Westbury, 1970). Another problem is that there is the need to judge, to decide on criteria, and to apply the criteria to a full range of curricular issues (Westbury, 1970). Taylor (1967) maintains that there are many ways in which an individual can view the curriculum, and these views may not be congruent with how others view curriculum.

One particular task of curriculum evaluation is that of evaluating individual series for adoption by a particular school or district. This is a time-consuming task, if done by a committee. Sometimes the adoption is made by an administrator without consulting others.

However it is done, the decision as to which series will be adopted by the school is one of importance. The textbook chosen helps to shape the curriculum, which in turn helps to shape teacher and student performance and knowledge (Lehr, 1979; Payne, 1974).

Once the decision has been made to enter the process of choosing a certain text then there are certain steps which are usually followed. Usually this process is undertaken to solve a specific problem pertaining to goals,
content, values, the philosophy of the school, or instructional procedures (Wright and Williams, 1977). But in the actual selection of the text, criteria need to be developed so that those evaluating the text will have guidelines to help in the decision making process. Although these criteria are varied, there are some which seem to be emphasized over and over again. Checklists and guides in choosing texts can be found in many sources including Fisher, Coyle, Steinmetz, (1977); Jevitz and Meints (1979); Bender and Baker (1979); Anderson et al. (1980); and Coursen (1977). Perhaps the most prominent of these lists was developed by Morrissett and Stevens (1967).

In order to evaluate textbooks in a systematic way, it is helpful to design an evaluation instrument. With the help of this tool the evaluators can have some kind of assurance that all important criteria are covered in the evaluation (Anderson et al., 1980; Morrissett and Stevens, 1967).

Perhaps the evaluation instrument can be more effectively utilized by a group or committee rather than an individual evaluator (Frymier, 1966; Niehaus, 1968; Hallenbeck, 1980; Wright and Williams, 1977). Hallenbeck (1980) suggests that an elementary textbook committee should be made up of teachers from lower grades balanced with upper grade teachers. These teachers should have varying amounts of classroom experience. Bender and Baker (1979) would also include teachers with various levels of educational expertise.
The task of this committee would be to go through the decision making process required to evaluate and select tasks. To do this task effectively the group must have some awareness of the decision making process as well as the evaluating process. One such process combines both of these elements into a model.

In 1967, and later, collaborating with colleagues in 1971, Stufflebeam developed a model which described the decision making/evaluation process. In this model, evaluation and decision making are closely related processes which hinge on each other.

If evaluation is a process that furnishes information useful in guiding decision making, the first step to be taken would be to find out what decision alternatives will be considered and what values or criteria will be applied. This information can only be obtained by getting involved in the subject to be evaluated. In other words, the entire purpose of evaluation is to service the decision making act (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). The timing of the steps in the decision making process must be set so the information gained is relevant to the problem.

As a process, decision making consists of four steps: awareness, design, choice, and action. These four steps potentially require evaluative information. Therefore, the relationship between evaluation and decision making is symbiotic (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).
Once these preliminary steps have been set up the evaluation process itself can begin. Depending upon the type of decisions which need to be made, Stufflebeam (1967) presents his CIPP evaluation model which outlines four types of evaluation.

Context evaluation is the first type of evaluation. It is the most basic type of evaluation. The purpose of context evaluation is to provide a rationale for the determination of objectives. Contingency and congruence are two models which comprise the methodology of context evaluation.

Input evaluation is the second type of evaluation, with the purpose of providing information to determine how to utilize resources to meet program goals: those goals identified by context evaluation. The end result of input evaluation is usually a proposed design for implementing a program. The methodology of input evaluation is varied and may depend upon literature, committee meetings, and judgements based upon personal experiences (Anderson, 1975).

The third type of evaluation is process evaluation. This kind of evaluation serves the day to day decision making needs required to carry out the program. Recording of events and describing what actually takes place is another function of process evaluation. This function helps to determine why objectives were achieved or not (Anderson, 1975; Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Product evaluation is the fourth type of evaluation. Its purpose is to measure and interpret to what extent
goals have been achieved, not only at the end of the cycle, but also during the cycle of decision making and evaluation. The methodology of product evaluation would include measurements against criteria set up for the study (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Because there is a basic relationship among these evaluative and decision making activities described in Stufflebeam's model, the process of evaluation and decision making is a continuous cycle which provides information to the evaluators.

However, the evaluators need to be aware of factors which add to the complexity of decision making before the final decision is made. The first factor which can influence decision making is that usually more than one decision maker contributes to any given decision. The second factor is that decisions often stand in contingent relationship to other decisions (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). These factors can pose problems to the evaluators, but once they are accounted for, the decision can be made on the basis of the evaluation.

The final decision does not end the process. "To maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of evaluation, evaluation itself should be evaluated" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). Therefore, the process of evaluation, which was originally used to evaluate a system should then be used to evaluate the process the group went through in their evaluation and decision making steps.
The writer spent three years on a committee which evaluated and selected religion textbooks. This committee did not, as a group, evaluate the process used in selecting these texts. The writer now sees that it may be valuable to apply the principles and model of evaluation to the work of the committee.

In summary, evaluation is a continuous cycle or process of obtaining information which is interrelated to decision making. This process, which has several steps and which includes several types, can be used to evaluate a program or curriculum. But to maximize the effectiveness of the evaluation, the evaluation process itself should be evaluated.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was twofold:
1. to describe a decision making/evaluation process which was used by a religion textbook committee and
2. to evaluate this process using an evaluation model proposed by Stufflebeam et al.

Procedure

Committee Membership: There were eleven female and one male elementary teachers who formed the core committee. These teachers had varying degrees of classroom experience, education, and came from different schools within the archdiocese. Grades one through eight were represented
by the members of this committee. The committee was also composed of seven theology/religious education consultants. The work of this committee had to be approved by the Superintendent of Catholic schools.

Setting: The evaluation process took place in a large metropolitan Catholic school system in the southeastern part of the United States. This archdiocese serves seventy-four elementary schools which range from semi-inner city schools to moderately affluent suburbia. The semi-inner city schools have a black population of about fifteen percent, whereas the suburban schools have only one percent. The semi-inner city schools had one class per grade, whereas the suburban schools averaged two classes per grade. Many Catholic adults have been educated in a Catholic grade and high school, and many of them who live in suburbia have graduate degrees.

Instrument: Stufflebeam et al.'s CIPP model of evaluation (1971) was used by the writer as an evaluative tool.

Implementation of the Process: The committee's work began in September, 1977, and continued for the following three years. During this period the committee met on a regular basis. The work concluded with the publication of the final report in December, 1980.

Description of the Process: During this three year period the work of the committee was divided into four phases. Phase One was a study of all of the religion series published before March 1, 1980. Ten religion series were
evaluated in all. Phase Two consisted of a second and more detailed study of the four series the committee decided to recommend for usage in the archdiocese. Phase Three concerned itself with the formulation of guidelines for the proper use of the recommended texts. Phase Four was the communication between the committee and the publishers of the series which had been evaluated. The work of the committee ended with the publication of the final report.

Statement of Terms

**Evaluation:** "The process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

**Process:** "A particular and continuing activity subsuming many methods and involving a number of steps or operations" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

**Decision making:** The process of acquiring information about an issue and comparing it to certain criteria so that a judgment can be made.

Results

Each phase of the evaluation process used by the religion textbook committee was evaluated by the writer using Stufflebeam et al.'s evaluation model as a tool. The results were reported qualitatively.
Assumptions and Limitations

The writer assumed that the evaluation process is a necessary step in deciding upon curriculum in schools.

The evaluation of the process of the study took place several months after the conclusion of the study.

The process of evaluating contains some subjective elements.

Summary

From the research it can be concluded that evaluation is an important tool for educators. Evaluation is a process which has several steps and can be applied on various levels. Many models of evaluation have been proposed, but Stufflebeam et al.'s model was used for the purposes of this study.

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to describe the decision making/evaluation process which was used by a religion textbook committee, and (2) to evaluate this process using an evaluation model proposed by Stufflebeam et al.

Evaluation is a continuing activity. Therefore, evaluating an evaluation is an important, yet neglected step in the process of evaluation.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Two reviews the literature regarding evaluation and evaluation models, especially as they pertain to curriculum evaluation. This chapter is divided into four major sections. They are entitled an overview of evaluation as applied to curriculum, evaluation models, Stufflebeam et al.'s process model of evaluation, and implications of evaluation models in curriculum evaluation.

An Overview of Evaluation as Applied to Curriculum

The concept and theory of evaluation has been part of our educational jargon for a relatively short period of time. In 1942, Woody considered it a "new-fangled" term. Nonetheless, since that time there has been a great deal of literature written about evaluation.

It can be observed that there are many definitions and concepts of evaluation. Each person in the educational field who uses the term defines it to fit the situation or need. The American Heritage Dictionary defines "evaluate" as "to ascertain, judge, or fix the value or worth of." Most of the definitions of evaluation contain these key ideas. Some authors use these ideas in relation to tests
and measurements, while others refer to evaluating a teacher or a program.

For example, Cronbach (1963), as many others, sees evaluation in this way: "the collection and use of information to make decisions about an educational program." Because many types of decisions can be made, evaluation is a diversified activity and no one set of principles will suffice for all situations.

Cronbach (1963) goes on to relate that systematic evaluation was first introduced as a method of course evaluation, and eventually, after the 1930's, became a term which described a teacher-training activity.

A broader purpose of evaluation is given by Neihuas (1968). He believes that educators need to evaluate so they can know where they have been, if they are there, and where they are going. Evaluation can also be used to explain and justify decisions. Niehaus sees a definite place for both quantitative and qualitative evaluation.

In the field of evaluation there are those who went beyond writing about evaluation in a broad sense and developed a systematic method of evaluation. An evaluation model is a description of a systematic method of evaluation. Some of the more important evaluation models are discussed below.
Evaluation Models

Evaluation models have contributed to the development of evaluation as an educational tool. Curriculum evaluation is one area of educational decision making where evaluation models are useful. These models help to examine relationships among various activities involved in curriculum evaluation (Payne, 1974). Many of these models are quite detailed and there is some overlap among those who have devised these models. The specification of instructional objectives plays a central role in nearly all models. All emphasize feedback and recycling phases. All share the assumption that an assessment of needs has been carried out prior to program development. All models also emphasize decision making and reflect the biases and individual intents of their developers (Payne, 1974). Some of the more important models of evaluation are given below.

**Tyler.** In one of the earliest evaluation models, Tyler (1942) gave six purposes of evaluation, six assumptions for evaluating outcomes of general education, and seven major steps of evaluation. His major steps of evaluation are as follows: (1) the school formulates statements of educational objectives which are classified into major types, (2) each objective is defined in terms of behavior, (3) situations where students are expected to display these types of behavior are identified, (4) promising methods for obtaining evidence regarding each type of objective is selected and tried, (5) additional new instruments are constructed, as
needed, to make a comprehensive appraisal. They are tried out to see if they can be used effectively, and, (6) promising appraisal methods are selected for further development and improvement. Tyler saw the process of evaluation as an integral part of the educational process which could call for reformulation, improvements and modifications in teaching and in the educational program itself.

Later, Tyler (1964) suggested that before deciding upon what to teach, a reasonable set of criteria must be developed. These questions deal with value systems in relation to the student, to society, and to the current state of knowledge.

Taylor. In an evaluation model developed by Taylor (1967) the evaluation process was divided into four steps: (1) identification of broad, societal-institutional objectives, (2) rephrasing these objectives into operational terms, (3) translation of these measurement operations into teaching practices, and (4) evaluating student outcomes after being subjected to these practices.

Metfessel and Michael. Metfessel and Michael's model (1967) followed Taylor's and is somewhat different in that they pointed out five important groups who should be consulted before and during various stages of the evaluation. These groups include lay persons, professional personnel, and students.

Michael and Metfessel (1967) used Tyler's model (1942) as a foundation and then proceeded to develop eight steps in
the evaluation process. These major steps are briefly outlined in temporal order. They are: (1) statement of the broad goals of the educational program, (2) development of specific behavioral objectives, (3) the translation or transformation of the specific behavioral objectives into a form applicable to facilitating learning, (4) selection and/or construction of a variety of instruments and measures to furnish data concerning the attainment of the behavioral objectives, (5) periodic observation and administration of tests and scales, (6) determination of behavioral changes relative to specific objectives, (7) interpretation of the data, and (8) recommendations leading to further implementation of the objectives in the educational program. Then the cycle of evaluation begins again.

Stake. Stake (1969) suggested that the "goal of evaluation is always the same: to determine the worth of something." Prior to evaluation three questions should be asked:

1. What is the entity that is to be evaluated?
2. Whose standards will be used as a reference mark?
3. What subsequent decisions can be anticipated?

These questions are the basis of the rest of the evaluation and so are critical to the process of the evaluation.

An important contribution Stake made to the field of evaluation is his analysis of judgment data. He defined judgment data as "personal value--commitments, educational aims, goals, objectives, priorities, perceived norms and standards--in one form or another" (Stake, 1970). Later
on he included attitudes and affective domain outcome data as judgment data. Because of the difficulty in gathering and reporting judgment data Stake indicated that many judgment data should be reported in narrative form and should be appropriate to the audience.

**Stufflebeam.** Stufflebeam (1967) used his Context-Input-Process-Product model of evaluation to expand the concept of evaluation into a process. He then defined evaluation as "the process of acquiring and using information for making decisions associated with planning, programming, implementing, and recycling program activities" (Stufflebeam, 1967). The rationale for the four stages of evaluation which Stufflebeam proposed in 1967 was to classify the many kinds of decisions which were to be served by the evaluation.

By 1971 Stufflebeam and others had refined this evaluation process. This refined process is discussed in the next section.

**Stufflebeam et al.'s Process Model of Evaluation**

Stufflebeam (et al., 1971) refined their process model of evaluation but continued to emphasize the decision making process in evaluation. Decision making is choosing between alternatives. This decision making process is of great interest to the evaluator because it provides information which aids in educational improvement.
The decision maker must be aware of options and have a basis for choosing among them. A personal or organizational value system provides this base. The decision maker now weighs the options against the criteria dictated by the value system. This process provides the information which helps the decision maker to judge the value of the option. It is assumed that it had been previously determined that a decision should be made and that needs assessment had been carried out (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Stufflebeam (et al., 1971) identified some of the tasks of evaluation as: identifying options, explicating values and criteria, and providing information that weighs the options in relationship to the criteria.

By definition, then, the evaluation process includes the decision making process: "Educational evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Evaluation as a process was further clarified by Stufflebeam (et al., 1971):

Of particular importance is the fact that the evaluation process is conceived as continuing rather than terminal or as having a discrete beginning or ending. Evaluation activities generally are (1) sequential, with each activity forming a logical base for the next, and (2) iterative, recurrent or cyclical.

If evaluation is a process which provides information useful in decision making, then the most useful information must be identified. It is important for the evaluator to
find out: (1) what decision alternatives are to be considered, and (2) what values or criteria will be applied. Therefore, there must be an interaction between the evaluator and the material to be evaluated (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

The process of evaluation described here comes close to the root meaning of the term 'to evaluate'.

Values come into play most meaningfully when choices are to be made, and the making of choices is the essential act of decision making. The proposal here is that the entire act of evaluation should center on the criteria to be invoked in making decisions (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

It has been demonstrated that decision making and evaluation are interrelated processes. The process of evaluation is a complex process involving many people. The effectiveness of the evaluation depends upon the cooperative effort of the group. The aim of evaluation is to provide better information for educational decision making (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Since the interrelatedness of the decision making process and the evaluation process has been established, it would be well to examine the four types of evaluations used in the evaluation process. These four types of evaluation are context, input, process, and product evaluation (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

**Context evaluation.** Context evaluation is the most basic type of evaluation. It does the groundwork for the rest of the evaluation process by providing a rationale for the determination of objectives. Context evaluation
identifies and diagnoses unmet needs and unused opportunities. Diagnosis of problems provides an essential base for developing objectives.

A distinguishing characteristic of context evaluation is that it describes the values and goals of the system to be looked at. With the help of this description, context evaluation determines whether practice is consistent with the values, so adjustments can be made in practices as necessary.

The methodology of context evaluation can be divided into two modes: contingency and congruence.

The contingency mode of context evaluation looks outside the particular system being evaluated and explores hypothetical questions pertinent to the future of the system. It looks for possible discrepancies between a possible action and likely results.

The congruence mode of context evaluation compares actual and intended program outcomes and asks the question, "How well are the goals being served?" This mode requires comprehensive and continual collection of data to allow comparison between the actual and intended outcome.

Input evaluation. Once the objectives have been determined, then the second type of evaluation begins. Input evaluation provides information for determining how to utilize resources to meet goals. It describes the resources available and determines the best use of those resources in terms of cost or benefits, resulting in a design to meet
the goals. As a result of input evaluation, the goals may be judged to be unrealistic. Then the information gained would be used to determine what could be done so that the goals could be reached.

The methodology of input evaluation is varied. Committee meetings, professional literature, consultations and personal experiences are used as data in making decisions.

Process evaluation. Process evaluation serves the day-to-day decision making needs required to carry out the process. It provides feedback to the organizers of the committee so that the operation can be monitored and potential problems in the design or implementation can be detected or predicted. The focus of process evaluation may include assessment of interpersonal relationships, communication channels, and adequacy of staff performance and facilities.

Another function of process evaluation is to help the program directors make decisions during the course of the program. Long-term goals were probably already established in context evaluation, but the decisions concerning their implementation are completed at this time. The clearer the input evaluation decisions were, the easier the task of process evaluation.

A third function of process evaluation is the recording of events through regular data collection. What happened during the program period can then be interpreted with better understanding.
The methodology of process evaluation may include a full-time evaluator, an evaluation instrument, regular meetings between the evaluators and personnel and the update of the process of the evaluation design.

**Product evaluation.** The fourth type of evaluation is product evaluation. Its purpose is to measure and interpret program attainments both during the evaluation cycle and at the end of the evaluation.

The general method of product evaluation includes stating definitions of objectives, measuring criteria associated with the objectives of the activity, and interpreting outcomes during the recorded context, input and process evaluation.

Product evaluation investigates the extent to which objectives have been attained. This provides feedback for controlling change procedures. Product evaluation works together with process evaluation to provide feedback (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

Stufflebeam's process model of evaluation suggested that evaluation is a continuous cycle of activity. Within this continuous cycle we can identify four kinds of evaluation. They are context, input, process, and product evaluation.

However, evaluation models have certain implications for their use in curriculum evaluation. Some of these implications are examined in the next section.
Implications of Evaluation Models in Curriculum Evaluation

It has been noted that evaluation and curriculum are related. Evaluation provides the judgment data to make decisions. There are different kinds of judgment data which need to be collected before decisions can be made which pertain to curriculum. Each of the evaluation models described above assumes these steps in attaining judgment data have been taken before the evaluation process begins. These procedures are examined here in more detail.

Importance of curriculum. Lehr (1979) gave an overview of an evaluation process for textbook selection. The premise of which Lehr based the need to evaluate was to say that "the textbook remains the heart of the curriculum..."

Payne (1974) examined several definitions of curriculum and finally concluded that "however one ultimately defines curriculum, one must accept that it includes everything that directs and stimulates the student experience and learning".

Coursen (1977) found conflicting moralities in education and more specifically in curriculum. He proposed that curriculum is important not only because it presents certain subject information, but also because of "hidden curriculum."

Therefore, as educators come to recognize the importance of education in shaping student values (the hidden curriculum) then, textbooks have come under more careful scrutiny (Coursen, 1977).
As textbooks come under scrutiny by those who are outside of the educational field, educators need to be sure of what criteria they have used to choose a curriculum for their school.

More important than justifying decisions to those outside of the educational field is the importance of the curriculum for student learning. Student learning is a major goal in education. To reach this goal curriculum must be chosen that contain appropriate learning material. Those evaluating the curriculum must be sure that several elements are contained in the evaluation process. These are criteria, an evaluation instrument, a committee, and a process or method of evaluation. These elements are discussed in the next section.

**Criteria.** Westbury (1970) maintained that the kind of data sought depends upon the needs which have been identified. To enter the process of evaluation is to claim the willingness to apply criteria to the curriculum which will judge it to be good or bad (Westbury, 1970). These criteria must be appropriate to the curriculum and eventually applied to the full range of curricular issues.

Once the criteria have been identified, Westbury (1970) thought it would be helpful to devise a method to use the criteria. Morrissett and Stevens (1967) indicated that a systematic method of analysis was helpful. They also asserted that "a framework of analysis can greatly improve the process of evaluation as compared to more casual methods of evaluation" (Morrissett and Stevens, 1967).
A systematic structure of analysis was outlined as follows: (1) descriptive characteristics of the text, (2) rationale, (3) objectives, (4) teacher capabilities and training, (5) structure of curriculum materials, (6) teacher strategies and learning theory, and (7) evaluation.

**Instrument.** This systematic analysis can be more effective if an evaluation instrument is devised. Anderson et al. (1980) gave their rationale for using an evaluation instrument. They claimed that the use of an evaluation instrument would facilitate the selection of materials. The type of instrument devised would be dependent upon its purpose.

If one were to combine any one of these models of evaluation into actual practice using the practical suggestions given by the above writers, it would be a mammoth task indeed for one person to accomplish alone. Effective curriculum evaluation must combine the knowledge of the process of evaluation plus the specific structure of how the task is to be accomplished. It would surely follow that it would take a committee of professional persons to go through the evaluation process and to be able to put this process to work using the skills and resources available to them.

**Committee.** Both Frymier (1966) and Bender and Baker (1979) indicated that many persons should be involved in the evaluation and selection process for curriculum. Hallenbeck (1980) was even more specific in stating that most textbook committees should be composed of seven to eleven
members, and there should be balanced representation from all grade levels and subject areas. Inexperienced as well as experienced teachers should compose the committee.

The process. Once this committee is formed and has progressed through the elements outlined above, they can begin the evaluation process. Even as they choose a systematic way to analyze, select, and evaluate texts, the group itself enters into a process of working together, weighing criteria and objectives, making decisions and finally arriving at a judgment as to which textbook will be chosen.

Even without having specific knowledge of evaluation models a committee will arrive at a process of obtaining information, evaluating data, and decision making. This process could be compared to any of the evaluation models presented in this paper to ascertain if the process was an effective one. The writer has chosen to compare it to Stufflebeam et al.'s model for two reasons. They are: (1) Stufflebeam's model is a process model, and (2) Stufflebeam views evaluation as a cycle of activities. The writer believes that if the evaluation study of the committee was a process then it can be evaluated using Stufflebeam's model.

It is the function of evaluation to examine the effectiveness of a program. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate an evaluation process. Those who have participated in this process can determine how well the goal of choosing the best, available curriculum for the students was
accomplished. The method of drawing up criteria, of using the evaluative tool, of discussing in committee meetings, can also be examined for their effectiveness. Many groups evaluate their product but fail to evaluate their process of evaluation. Therefore they lose valuable information which could contribute to a more effective evaluation process the next time.

Conclusion. Engaging in an effective evaluation process can provide information which is basic to decision making. This evaluation process is a continuous cycle of delineating, obtaining, and providing information.

Several theories and principles regarding evaluation have been presented and examined. All of the models presented have a cycle of activities that must be followed. Criteria is used to judge the external process of choosing a text or program. This external process is important but what is also important is the process of evaluation that the committee went through. This could be considered an internal process within the group. This internal process consists of how well the committee was able to utilize the information acquired during the data-gathering process. This internal process would also include how well the committee was able to translate the decisions into a textbook which would meet most needs.

To maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of evaluation, the evaluation process itself should be evaluated. This evaluation helps to identify the strengths
and weaknesses of the evaluation so that better educational decisions can be made in the future.

Since Stufflebeam et al.'s model is a continuous cycle of evaluation, it can best be utilized to evaluate the evaluation process of a textbook selection committee.

Summary

Chapter Two dealt with a summary of the theories and the literature pertaining to the evaluation process, especially as it pertains to the curriculum evaluation process. The implications of evaluation models for curriculum evaluation were also discussed. Special emphasis was placed on Stufflebeam et al.'s process model of evaluation.

Finally, it was concluded that evaluation processes also need to be evaluated. Evaluation of evaluation processes provides for more effective educational decisions.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

In this chapter the procedure used to carry out the problem statement is described. There are five sections. They are committee membership, the setting, the instrument of evaluation, the implementation of the evaluation process, and a description of the evaluation process.

Committee Membership

A core committee of religion teachers was formed to study each grade level of all religion series published by March 1, 1980. There were eleven female and one male elementary teachers who formed this core committee. These teachers had varying degrees of classroom experience, education and came from approximately twelve different parochial schools within the Archdiocese. This committee included not only experienced teachers on every grade level but also several new teachers who could evaluate the usefulness of each series for beginning teachers.

The committee members had a variety of education ranging from bachelor degrees to masters degrees. Some members had completed work beyond the masters level.
One member of the committee served as the coordinator of the committee. He established and directed and activities of the committee, arranged and chaired the meetings, compiled the data gathered by the committee, was the liaison with the publishers, and prepared the final written report which was distributed to the publishers. He also was the theology consultant for each of the series with the other theology consultants on the committee.

In addition to the core committee, seven theology/religious education consultants who each specialized in studying one particular series also served. These consultants assisted the core committee of religion teachers in the data-gathering and the evaluation process.

Setting

The evaluation process took place in a large metropolitan Catholic school system in the southeastern part of the United States. This Archdiocesan school system serves seventy-four elementary schools which range from semi-inner city schools to moderately affluent suburbia. The semi-inner city schools have a black population of about fifteen percent, whereas the suburban schools have only one percent. The semi-inner city schools had one class of students per grade. Most of the parents involved in the evaluation process have had a Catholic grade and high school education. Many parents in suburbia had college degrees. Some had graduate degrees.
Instrument of Evaluation

An analytical tool (Appendix A) was constructed for the analysis of each of nine recent textbook series. The twenty-five open-ended questions and many of the doctrinal points were drawn from the principles presented in the General Catechetical Directory, Basic Teachings, To Teach As Jesus Did, Sharing the Light of Faith (The National Catechetical Directory), and from previous studies undertaken in other dioceses.

Implementation of the Evaluation Process

In Spring, 1977, a decision was made to evaluate all basic elementary school religion textbook series currently being published for grades one through eight. The primary purpose of this evaluative study was to guide the schools in choosing the best available texts.

By September, 1977 a core committee of religion teachers had been formed. Their goal was to study and evaluate each grade level of the series, one series at a time. Theology and religious education consultants were enlisted to assist the core committee of religion teachers. Each theology/religious education consultant specialized in one series.

The committee's work lasted approximately three years. During this period the committee met on a regular basis, usually every two weeks for three hours or more. At this
time each committee member would list the strengths and weaknesses of the series as evidenced in the particular grade level evaluated. Each person's report was discussed by the whole committee and areas of disagreement and agreement were noted by the coordinator. If there was a particular area of disagreement the committee would discuss the matter to discover the source of discrepancy.

After all of the core committee had given individual reports then the theology/religious education consultant would give the major areas of doctrinal and scriptural content which were strengths or weaknesses in the series as a whole. This data was discussed by the core committee in light of the data previously discussed. Major areas of strengths and weaknesses were agreed upon. Those areas which were not agreed upon were set aside for further discussion at the next meeting.

The coordinator took the information and compiled it into a written report for the next meeting.

The following meeting began with a final summation of the work done during the previous meeting. When this was completed the committee began the process of evaluating the next religion series.

When all the texts had been evaluated individually, then the process of screening out texts began. The committee did this by agreeing upon certain criteria or principles. A more detailed study was done of each text with special emphasis on those which had been chosen by the
committees for recommendation to the archdiocese. This major section of the evaluation was done in four phases.

Description of the Evaluation Process

During the three year period that the committee worked, the evaluation process was divided into four phases. Each of these phases will be described here.

Phase I: General Study of All Series: This phase consisted of several steps: (1) an analysis of each series in itself to discover its unique characteristics, (2) a general comparison of each series to all others to highlight the respective strengths and weaknesses of each, (3) the establishment of certain criteria for the screening out of any unacceptable series, and (4) the determining of the text series to be recommended.

An analytical tool was constructed for the analysis of each series. There were twenty-five open-ended questions which dealt with (1) the program as a whole, (2) parents as coeducators, (3) teacher material, (4) student material, and (5) doctrine and morals contained within the specific text. Each member of the core committee had approximately two weeks to evaluate the text using this tool. The meetings to discuss the data which had been gathered were conducted as described above. After each series was analyzed and evaluated in this manner, the committee compared the series with each other. It was hoped that this comparison would serve to highlight the more obvious differences among the series.
The committee met every two weeks to compare these series using the analytical tool as the structure for the comparison and evaluation. The content of the analytical tool became the basic criteria by which the series were compared. The committee was careful to identify strengths and weaknesses of each series. These were recorded by the coordinator after the committee had come to a consensus. These were then presented to the committee at the next meeting for further discussion.

Faced with the decision of screening out series which could not be recommended as basic texts, the committee drew up four basic principles or criteria by which the texts could be evaluated. These principles or criteria were (1) no series not yet in print could be recommended, (2) no series lacking sufficient material for a full year of religious instruction on any given grade level could be recommended, (3) any series to be out of print in the near future would not be recommended, and, (4) no text series would be considered acceptable if it contained poor catechetical presentations of Church doctrine or if it employed substantial amounts of defective pedagogy.

These principles eliminated several series from further study by the committee. Only four of the series studied were recommended for further evaluation by the committee. The general consensus of the committee was that although there were areas which needed improvement, there were also areas of strengths which could be capitalized upon.
The narrowing down of the evaluation to four basic texts brought the committee to the second phase of the study.

Phase II: A Detailed Comparison of the Recommended Basic Texts. The four recommended texts were compared to each other by the committee from seven different perspectives. The series were compared to each other first, as whole entities; second, from the point of view of the parent material; third, from the perspective of the teacher's manual and other materials; fourth, from the vantage point of the student's textbook; fifth, from the view of the signs of catechesis; sixth, from the viewpoint of content; and seventh, from the perspective of social ministry and social justice.

Each program as a whole was compared and contrasted using these basic criteria: a detailed examination of philosophy and objectives of each series; a balanced pedagogical approach of activities and doctrine; an examination of the term 'real life experience' and what it meant in each of the series; the sequential development of material in each series; the number of religion classes per year that each series provided and the durability of the teacher's manual as well as the student text. The strengths and weaknesses of each series were noted using each of these criteria.

Next, the parent material was examined because the committee felt that it was important to be able to involve parents in an active and meaningful way in the catechesis of their own children.
It was recognized by the committee that each series had its own format of presenting parent materials but the criteria for judging this material included the length of parent material, the variety of activities suggested for use, the practicality of the parent's notes, and the understandability of the material given for parent use. Again, the strengths and weaknesses of each series were evaluated according to these criteria.

The teacher manual was evaluated using the criteria of adequate background on the program as a whole available in the teacher's manual; adequate goals and objectives of the series as a whole and each lesson adequately explained; vocabulary and reading level appropriate to the age; activities presented for teacher use; availability of evaluation and review lessons or activities; format of teacher material; and the practicality of activities and supplemental materials for each series.

The student's basic text was evaluated using the criteria of durability, format, art, reading level appropriate to the age, sensitivity to the psychological, cognitive and moral development of the child.

The content of catechesis in the student text was evaluated using criteria lifted from the document, *Sharing the Light of Faith*. This includes the four basic signs of catechesis: natural signs, ecclesial signs, liturgical signs, and biblical signs.
The doctrinal content of the texts was evaluated using the criteria taken from The National Catechetical Directory. Some of the core committee members evaluated this section using the analytical tool developed for this evaluation, but the religious education consultants did the major portion of this evaluation.

Once the committee had an overview of each of the series to be recommended, it became apparent that they could only be recommended with reservations. In this way phase three of the process evolved.

Phase III: Practical Guidelines. The committee recognized that while each of the series had certain strengths which would enhance the religious education program in a school, there were also certain limitations inherent in each of the series. For this reason, the committee made suggestions or recommendations regarding each of the series. The committee tried to keep the suggestions as practical as possible. These suggestions were made relative to each of the four series being recommended for use.

An outline of the suggestions includes (1) parent outreach, (2) faculty outreach, (3) student outreach which also included supplementing a program scriptually, doctrinally or with education pertaining to sex, drugs and justice, and (4) administrative considerations.

Not only were these practical guidelines published, but the committee also gave a series of workshops held in various locations reaching out to all parochial schools to
explain the strengths and weaknesses of each program. Committee members were available at these workshops to share information or insight.

When the practical guidelines had been written and the rest of the material compiled, a draft of the report was sent to the publishers for comment, which began phase four of the evaluation.

Phase IV: The Publishers Comment. The committee was aware of the limitations within which it worked: (1) it was difficult to study so many series and yet maintain clarity and accuracy of thought, (2) it was especially difficult to study doctrinal or scriptual content of series who had no index in the book, and (3) there was present an element of subjectivity. It was for these reasons the evaluation report was sent to the publishers for comments.

Each publisher was sent a copy of the evaluation by registered mail on or before May 13, 1980. The publishers were invited to respond within five weeks so the comments could be included as part of the final report.

The cover letter sent to the publishers with the evaluation and the letters of response received from the publishers, were printed in the final draft of the report.

The committee received a copy of the final draft and was asked to make any corrections or comments and to be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting. The committee met and discussed the report. After corrections were made, it was submitted to the superintendent of Catholic schools for approval.
The report was published in December, 1980. This officially ended the work of the committee.

Summary

In this chapter the procedure used to carry out the evaluative study was discussed. Included in the chapter were sections pertaining to committee membership, the setting, the subject of the evaluation, the instrument of evaluation, the implementation of the evaluation process, and a description of the evaluative process.
CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE EVALUATIVE PROCESS

In this chapter the evaluation process of the religion textbook committee was evaluated by using Stufflebeam's process model of evaluation. The four major aspects of Stufflebeam's model which include context, input, process, and product evaluation were used to evaluate the phases of the committee's work.

The underlined sentences give the key aspects of Stufflebeam's evaluation model as understood by the writer. The rest of the section compares the evaluative process of the committee to Stufflebeam's model.

Context Evaluation

Context evaluation provides a rationale for the determining of objectives. The committee's rationale for the study was to guide the Catholic schools in choosing the best, available religion texts. This rationale determined the method of approaching the study of the series. One objective of the committee was to study and evaluate each grade level, one series at a time.

In the course of the evaluative study, other goals were seen to be necessary. At the conclusion of the study,
four goals had evolved: (1) to explain the process by which certain religion series had been selected, approved and recommended; (2) to delineate the strengths and weaknesses of the four recommended series; (3) to offer specific suggestions regarding the proper usage and effective enrichment of these series; and (4) to foster dialogue with the publishers of each series.

Context evaluation diagnoses unmet needs and unused opportunities. Diagnosis of the unmet needs was done by the coordinator of the committee prior to the formation of the committee. In his work he had discovered it was necessary to know what series could be recommended through the Archdiocesan office. It was this need to learn each series thoroughly which led to the formation of the committee.

People with varying degrees of education and teaching experience were chosen as members of the committee. This added a broader dimension to the committee and the kind of work it was able to do.

The committee recognized that it was also necessary to have teachers already using the series to give their evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the series they were using. The committee did not try to rely only on the data of their own finding.

Discussions and questionnaires were the methods of diagnosis used by the committee.
Context evaluation describes the values and goals of the system to be looked at. The values and doctrinal points considered essential to the content of the series were drawn from principles presented in the *General Catechetical Directory*, *Basic Teachings, To Teach as Jesus Did*, *Sharing the Light of Faith* (The National Catechetical Directory) and from previous studies conducted in other dioceses.

The teaching methodology of the series was also evaluated by evaluating the program's pedagogy, sequential development, parent program, supplemental materials, format, lesson background, reading level of the student text, student activities, and practical applications. These are essential elements in evaluating most texts.

On another level, the process of evaluation used by the committee can be evaluated. It was through study and careful reading of each text that each committee member was able to determine if the series met the needs of the teachers of the archdiocese. This process of study was done in a limited amount of time since the committee had so many series to evaluate. The process of discussion was used to refine ideas and information that committee members had obtained about the series.

Our goal as a committee was to complete the evaluation of the series in a reasonable length of time. The evaluation of each series was time-consuming. Yet the evaluation and the discussions helped to bring the committee to
specific criteria or objectives in eliminating the series from recommendation.

In summary, context evaluation was used by the committee in several aspects of the evaluative study. Context evaluation helped the committee to assess needs, to formulate goals and objectives, and to base goals and objectives on values and doctrine found in approved guidelines.

Input Evaluation

Input evaluation provides information for determining how to utilize resources to meet goals. The committee went through several steps in the four phases of the study to obtain the needed information.

In phase one, each core committee member analyzed each series using an analytical tool. (Appendix A) This required each committee member to look for information on doctrinal content and methodology. The information was brought to the core committee to be discussed. Major areas of strengths and weaknesses had to be agreed upon by all members. This information was compiled into a written report and presented at the following meeting for further discussion, if needed.

After each series had been evaluated, then it was compared to other series. This was to highlight obvious differences in the series. The content of the analytical tool became the basic criteria by which the series was compared.
On the basis of the information obtained through evaluation and discussion, the committee proceeded to draw up criteria by which the texts could be further evaluated. These criteria eliminated several series from further study.

In phase two, further information was needed about each of the four series to be recommended for use. These series were compared to each other using the basic criteria decided upon by the committee. Strengths and weaknesses of each program were noted using these criteria. The information gained was on several levels: information about each series as a whole; information about parent material, information about the teacher's manual, information about the student's text; information about the inclusion or exclusion of the signs of catechesis, information about doctrinal content, and information about teachings of social justice and social ministry.

Once the information was attained, it was clear to the committee that each of the four series could only be recommended with reservations.

Guidelines for the use of the series and workshops to explain the strengths and weaknesses of each program were part of the process used in phase three to gather information and utilize resources.

In phase four of the study, the evaluation report was sent to the publishers for comment or clarification.

Input evaluation describes resources available and determines the best use of resources in terms of cost or
benefits. The information attained in this evaluative study could help teachers in their teaching of religion. In this regard it could be considered as describing available resources. The information or resource given was the detailed comparison of each of the recommended texts. This comparison included objectives and philosophy, pedagogical techniques, the relationship of the content to the real life experience of the children, sequential development of the material, the number of classes provided by the series per year, and the durability of the texts.

Resources were also described in terms of the parent material available in the series, the format and content of the teacher manual, and the supplemental materials available.

Content resources included the signs of catechesis and doctrinal content contained in the series. These were judged to be "excellent", "very good", "good", "fair", or "poor" by the theological consultants.

Financial considerations of each series were done in a very limited way. This could be considered a limitation of the evaluative study, especially since it is a major consideration in Stufflebeam's input evaluation. It was not the purpose of this evaluative study to let financial considerations influence whether or not a series would be recommended by the committee.

In summary, input evaluation was an essential part of the committee's evaluation process in almost every phase of the study. Many methods of gathering information were
used by the committee, including meetings, literature related to the field, and evaluations by teachers who were using the series under consideration.

Process Evaluation

Process evaluation provides feedback to the organizers of the committee so that periodic assessment may occur.

The organizer of this committee was also the committee coordinator. He directed the activities of the committee as he facilitated each meeting. This coordinator also compiled the data which had been gathered by the committee during each phase of the evaluative study. This written compilation served as feedback for the committee as well as for the coordinator.

Data was gathered by the evaluators with the use of the evaluative tool. This tool was detailed and quite lengthy. Its value for the committee was that it guided the evaluators in gathering essential data. That data was then discussed with the other members of the committee and judgments made on the basis of that data were refined.

The entire evaluative study took approximately three years. Many of the members had not anticipated that the study would take so long. The coordinator of the committee also realized that the length of the study was putting limitations on the accuracy of the evaluation. Some series had begun to revise their texts before the evaluative study was complete. This signaled to both the coordinator and
the core committee that some of the results of that particular study would be out-of-date rapidly.

It was noted by the coordinator in working with the core committee that there were several instances where the committee was clearly split in their evaluation of a particular series. This caused a tension among the committee members and sometimes delayed the decision making process until a consensus could be reached. Sometimes this meant that the committee had to draw up criteria to be used in further decision making.

Process evaluation may involve decisions concerning the implementation of the long-term goals. The data and feedback which had been obtained in the input evaluation helped the committee to make decisions about which series would be eliminated from the study and which would be evaluated further. This brought the committee closer to the goal of recommending certain series to the archdiocese.

The information gained during the comparative study of the series helped the committee to decide that the series could only be recommended with reservations. This decision led to the decision to publish the suggestions or recommendations regarding each of the series. Both of these decisions brought the committee closer to their long range goal. Finally, the decision to have workshops in various locations to explain the strengths and weaknesses of each series also brought the committee closer to its final recommendations.
The coordinator thought that it was necessary to receive feedback from the publishers of each of the series which had been evaluated. Each publisher was sent a copy of the evaluation by registered mail and was invited to respond. The committee reviewed the feedback given by the publishers and corrections were made as needed. These letters of response from the publishers were printed in the final report of the committee.

In summary, the coordinator received various types of feedback as to progress of the committee in reaching its goal. This feedback came through recording the data from the evaluative tool, through committee meetings between the coordinator and the core committee, comparing the information against criteria set up by the committee, and the publishers' responses.

A formal assessment of the interpersonal relationships and communication channels was never made. Nor did the committee have a full-time evaluator who was responsible for evaluating the process of the evaluative study.

Product Evaluation

Product evaluation measures and interprets program attainments during the evaluation cycle and at the end of the evaluation. During the course of the evaluation study, data was recorded and distributed to the members. This data was then discussed and re-evaluated. This process was done continuously throughout the evaluative process.
During each phase of the evaluative study, criteria were drawn up as a guide in evaluating each specific series. The basis of these criteria was the evaluative tool.

At the end of the evaluative study, a draft of the final report was sent to all involved for further evaluation before publication. Revisions were made as needed and the final report, with its recommendations, was published by the Superintendent of schools.

Product evaluation investigates the extent to which objectives have been attained. At the end of the final report published by the archdiocese, the coordinator of the evaluative study stated the goals of the study. The final report also recognized strengths and weaknesses of the evaluative study. These were not always explicitly stated, but were obvious to those who read the publishers' responses, and who consider the length of the process of the study.

The committee did evaluate the work that it had done in the evaluative study, both during the evaluation process and by critiquing the draft of the final report. But the committee did not attempt to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the internal evaluation process that was used.

The internal evaluation process used by the committee was not as effective or clear as it could be since it was not formally evaluated by the committee. If this particular evaluation process would be duplicated by other people who study textbooks, they would be limited in their
knowledge of the strengths and limitations of the process.

In summary, product evaluation did take place throughout the evaluative study and at the end of the study. Criteria and objectives were used as measures throughout the study. Only the product of the committee's efforts was evaluated, not the internal process that the committee used in evaluating.

Discussion of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluative study conducted by the archdiocese was to obtain enough information about various series so that recommendations could be made. The process of evaluation was a continuous cycle of obtaining information, evaluating judgments, refining information, and making decisions. The task of obtaining information was a time-consuming one because information had to be gotten from various sources.

Although the committee may not have recognized it, they were going through a process of obtaining, delineating, and providing information to make a decision about curriculum. The committee did, in fact, use a process of evaluation which could be evaluated using Stufflebeam's evaluation model. The steps of the evaluative study used by the archdiocesan committee are not as clear-cut as the one Stufflebeam proposes, but through examination one can trace the process and compare the two.
The committee, without knowing there were models of evaluation, did have to formulate their own evaluative process to function effectively and to accomplish their goals.

Summary

In this chapter, the evaluative process of the religion textbook committee was evaluated by using Stufflebeam's process model of evaluation. The four major aspects of Stufflebeam's model, which include context, input, process, and product evaluation, were used to evaluate the phases of the committee's work.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The ability to choose the best available texts for use in our schools is a real challenge, especially when so many different texts are available. The educator needs to have a method or process of obtaining information, evaluating data, and decision making. Equally important is the ability to evaluate the evaluation process. This is important because further information is gained which helps to improve decision making.

The intent of this project was to describe a decision making/evaluation process which was used by a religion textbook committee and to evaluate this process by using an evaluation model proposed by Stufflebeam et al.

The basic elements of the committee's evaluative study included committee membership, the setting, the evaluation instrument, and the implementation of the process. The process itself was conducted in four phases. Each phase was evaluated using Stufflebeam et al.'s evaluation model. This model includes context, input, process, and product evaluation.
The committee did arrive at a process of obtaining information, evaluating data, and making decisions even though they had no formal knowledge of evaluation models. The committee's evaluation corresponded to Stufflebeam's process model until the end of the evaluative study. At the end of their study, the committee evaluated the product of their study, but did not evaluate the process of their study. Their failure to evaluate the process of their study resulted in lost information which could have aided the committee members in other committee work of that type.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Can evaluation models be used to evaluate the evaluative process of a committee? Stufflebeam's model can be used by those who see their work as a continuous activity of obtaining information.

Evaluators should be aware that the product of the evaluation should be evaluated. Equally important, but easily overlooked, the process of evaluation should also be evaluated. Evaluation of both the product and process of evaluation maximizes the effectiveness of the evaluation. If the evaluation is effective, then decisions can be made about curriculum which are educationally sound.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BASIC RELIGION TEXTS

I. Program As a Whole

1. Objectives and philosophy clearly stated as aiming to develop child's personal growth in faith

2. Child centered orientation (teacher and child directed activities in balance)

3. Balanced variety of pedagogical technique

4. Content related to real life experience of the child

5. Real sequential development of material

II. Parents as Coeducators

6. Enough background on whole program

7. Enough background on individual lessons

8. Adequate suggestions for development and reinforcement of lessons at home

III. Teacher Material

9. Adequate Background
   a. On program as a whole
   b. On grade as a whole
   c. On the psychology, pedagogy, doctrine, and theology needed for each lesson

10. Are lessons already outlined with theme, objectives, and material clearly stated?

11. Are materials and exercises needed for each lesson practical, available, appropriate?

12. Good supplemental materials and activities
13. Overall format and arrangement - clear, attractive, practical
14. Comfortable and adequate for new teachers
15. Other - e.g., contain student text, etc.

IV. Student Material

16. What is consumable? What is non-consumable?
17. Durability
18. Format attractive
19. Pictures attractive and useful for learning
20. Reading level appropriate
21. Activity level appropriate
22. Is child's psychology considered and capitalized on?
23. Do the lessons conclude with practical applications the child can clearly use?
24. Is the child introduced to a balance of
   a. Contemporary life situations
   b. Scripture
   c. Church doctrine and morality
   d. Prayer
25. Are the following doctrines and morals covered? Are they covered adequately?

Church
   - as Community
   - as hierarchy
   - history of

Creation
Ecumenism
Eschatology
Faith
Hope
God the Father
God the Son
God the Holy Spirit
Jesus Christ
   - God
   - Man
- Incarnation
- Life
- Life and Death
- Resurrection and Ascension

Mary

Morality
- Beatitudes
- Charity
- Commandments toward
  - God
  - Church
  - Family
- Truth (Lying)
- Chastity
- Life, care of
  - Unborn
  - Babies
  - Handicapped
  - Elderly
  - Dying
- Nature (Ecology)
- Justice
  - for Races
  - for Sexes
  - Inner City
  - Rural and Migrant
  - World
  - Peace
  - Conscience

Prayer
- Personal
- Shared
- Common
- Liturgy
  - Liturgical Seasons
  - Saints

Revelation
- Natural
- Supernatural

Sacraments
- In General
- Baptism
- Confirmation
- Penance
- Eucharist
- Mass
- Real Presence
- Matrimony
- Holy Orders
- Anointing

Sacred Scripture
- O.T. (Jewish)
- Gospels
- Acts
- Epistles
- As God Speaking

Sin
- Original
- Personal (Def.)
- Venial
- Serious

Supernatural
- Life and Grace

Trinity
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