What is self-evaluation?

- Stakeholders as "owners" of the evaluation process
- Variants:
  - Self-initiated vs. externally initiated (James, 1987)
  - Combinations with external evaluation (Nevo, 2001)
  - Internal or external expertise (Specht, 1998)
Relation to other evaluation approaches

- Structural similarities with
  - Participatory evaluation (Cousins & Whitmore, 1998)
  - Stakeholder-based evaluation (Bryk, 1983; Greene, 1988)
  - Empowerment evaluation (Fettersman, 1994, 1996)
  - Democratic evaluation (House & Howe, 2000)
  - Fourth-generation evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1989)
  - Responsive evaluation (Stake, 1975)

- Common rationale
  - Criticism of "traditional" evaluation approaches
  - Increased influence of stakeholders
  - Emphasis on utilization

Problem

- Increasing popularity of self-evaluation approaches in European schools
- Theoretical and empirical deficits of current research:
  1. What exactly is self-evaluation and how is it related to other evaluation approaches?
  2. What are the preconditions of its successful implementation in schools?
Self-evaluation in a descriptive evaluation theory context

- Functions
  - Primary: improvement
  - Secondary:
    - promoting communication
    - documentation
    - further education
- Objects
  - institutional practice
  - programs
- Temporal aspects
  - process-oriented

Organization
- strongly participative
- internal

Methodology
- qualitative methods
- exploratory

Standards
- utility
- feasibility
- propriety

Consequences and conditions of successful school self-evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions of success</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Improvement of individual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensions</td>
<td>Reflection and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with procedures</td>
<td>Further education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositional factors</td>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal commitment</td>
<td>Improvement of organizational work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational level</strong></td>
<td>Decision support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and functions of the self-evaluation</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions of the self-evaluation</td>
<td>Communication and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance information</td>
<td>Instruments and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational embeddedness</td>
<td>Quality of self evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of self evaluation team</td>
<td>Evaluation expertise (training or external)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-evaluation in the national innovation program SEMIK

- Self-evaluation in five project teams with external evaluation expertise
- Main objective: improvement of everyday work and project results

1. Clarify area of evaluation
2. Set goals and standards
3. Determine indicators
4. Find or develop instruments
5. Collect data
6. Interpret data
7. Give feedback
8. Draw and carry out consequences

Research questions

- Which input and process factors of self-evaluation contribute to explaining its consequences on different levels?

1. Predictors of individual benefit
2. Predictors of organizational benefit
3. Predictors of cost-benefit-ratio
Adapted framework model

Success conditions

**Input**
- Expectations
- Apprehensions*
- Lack of familiarity*

**Process**
- Self-determination
- Personal commitment
- Cooperation of self-evaluation team
- Evaluation expertise (training or external)
- Quality of self-evaluation process
- Instruments and methods

**Outcome**
- Individual benefit
- Cost-benefit-ratio
- Organizational benefit

*negative factor

Individual level
- Advance information
- Organizational embeddedness

Organizational level

Design of the study

Self-evaluation in five SEMIK projects
01/2000-12/2002

Qualitative pilot study
Interviews with project management (N=4)
08-10/2002

Preparation of the main study
11/2002-01/2003

Main study
Online questionnaire for teachers (N=49)
02-03/2003
Online questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual input factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of familiarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual process factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational input factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational embeddedness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational process factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments and methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual benefit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational benefit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit-ratio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: Individual benefit

**Success conditions**

- **Input**
  - Expectations

- **Process**
  - Self-determination

- **Outcome**
  - Individual benefit

**Consequences**

- Cooperation of self-evaluation team
- Evaluation expertise (training or external)

- **Individual level**
  - Apprehensions
  - Lack of familiarity

- **Organizational level**
  - Advance information
  - Organizational embeddedness

**Correlation Coefficients**

- Rcorr² = .67

**Significance Levels**

- **p < .05**
- *p < .10
Results: Organizational benefit

**Success conditions**

**Input**
- Expectations

**Process**
- Self-determination

**Outcome**
- Organizational benefit
  - \( R_{\text{corr}}^2 = .51 \)
  - \( \star \star p < .05 \)

**Consequences**

**Expectations**
- Advance information
  - \( .27** \)

**Lack of familiarity**
- Cooperation of self-evaluation team
  - \( .39** \)

**Organizational embeddedness**
- Evaluation expertise
  - \( \text{(training or external)} \)

**Instruments and methods**
- Quality of self-evaluation process
  - \( .27** \)

**Personal commitment**
- Individual level

**Organizational benefit**
- Print level

Results: Cost-benefit-ratio

**Success conditions**

**Input**
- Apprehensions*

**Process**
- Self-determination

**Outcome**
- Cost-benefit-ratio
  - \( R_{\text{corr}}^2 = .76 \)
  - \( \star \star p < .05 \)

**Consequences**

**Expectations**
- Advance information
  - \( .27** \)

**Lack of familiarity**
- Cooperation of self-evaluation team
  - \( .34** \)

**Organizational embeddedness**
- Evaluation expertise
  - \( \text{(training or external)} \)

**Instruments and methods**
- Quality of self-evaluation process
  - \( .26** \)

**Personal commitment**
- Individual level

**Organizational benefit**
- Organizational level
Consequences for practice

- **Main results:**
  - Primacy of self-initiated self-evaluation
  - Watch out for dispositional factors!
  - Provide evaluation expertise

- **Additional results:**
  - Provide advance information
  - Facilitate cooperation, if necessary
  - Use effective instruments and methods

Consequences for research

- **Theoretical research**
  - Further refinement of framework model
  - More precise causal assumptions

- **Empirical research**
  - Replication in other contexts
  - Investigation of the complete model
  - Investigate dispositional factors