

MEASUREMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY: SUMMARY AND PROGNOSIS

Frederic D. Weinfeld, U.S. Office of Education

It is unfortunate that in a society which talks so much about the need for the best possible education for its youth we are forced by honesty to say that the evaluation of its educational processes and institutions is woefully behind the state of the art. "Good schools," "excellence," "quality education" and other loose terms are bandied about without definition. If we attempt to cut through the semantics we find that the terms are operationally defined by the criteria used in their evaluation. To some, therefore, a "good" school system is one which has a highly paid staff and a low pupil-teacher ratio, to others it is one which has an active PTA, or one which is building new and beautiful structures, or one which is expending large sums of money on modern technical learning aids, or one which is introducing innovations in techniques, materials, and curricula. In short, it is assumed that the school which does something more than other schools is a better school. There is an obvious hiatus here between school practices, policies, and facilities which are considered beneficial and their actual effect upon the students. Little focus is put on the real educational output of the school, the level of educational attainment of the students; instead inappropriate headcounts, such as the number of students going on to prestige colleges, the number of Merit Scholars, the amount of scholarship funds awarded to the students, or in some cases, the average test scores of the school are used as criteria of school quality. And so the logical criterion measure of output, the amount of change or growth in the student himself brought about by the school is neglected. Under the egalitarian views of some of our educators, it is assumed that our schools do equally well for all students and develop them to the full extent of their potential--whatever that misunderstood and troublesome cliché means.

The school system should be evaluated, as any other operating system would be, by the efficiency of the system, measured in output per unit input within classifications of schools grouped according to their size, funds available, type, etc. In other words, compared to other similar schools how much "bang" is a school getting for its "buck." This is indeed a stark way of looking at the problem. We must discard descriptive characteristics of a school system as the valid criterion of what it accomplishes. Though chrome ornaments on an automobile add to its decorative appeal they in no way add to the performance of the vehicle itself; so too in education the performance of the system is the proper criterion, not its "good looks." But if indeed we wish to use the beauty of a school plant as a criterion measure let us do it, but let us not call the resulting scale "quality of education" or impute it to be a measure of what goes on inside the school.

It has been assumed that the more money a school spends the better it is. Only insofar as higher expenditures do indeed contribute to the educational attainment of the students, is per pupil expenditure a valid criterion measure. In fact data has revealed that some schools with meager budgets are contributing more to the growth of the students than other less efficient, overrated schools with higher expenditures. The effects of other school characteristics, such as school policies and practices, upon student output must first be investigated before advocating school expenditure as valid measures of school quality.

Schools have many educational goals and outcomes, such as the ability to think and evaluate constructively and creatively, the appreciation of our democratic heritage, the acquisition of good habits and attitudes, etc., and specific criteria are needed for evaluating the schools effectiveness in meeting each of the defined objectives. For many of such goals we have not yet devised satisfactory measuring instruments. However, one major goal of the schools which is conceded by everyone is the acquisition of basic skills in the use of words and numbers. Since standardized achievement tests currently in use by the schools measure the level of student achievement in the various basic skills, they can be used as a criterion measure of the schools effectiveness in achieving this specific goal.

As hot as the "pursuit of excellence" has been in the past decade, the quarry has eluded us because the searching parties have been few and ill-equipped. The members of educational establishments have in the past been reluctant to evaluate themselves, today they are only slightly more receptive to the idea of finding out what is going on in the schools. They are concerned with the testing of students, and achievement test scores are, of course, proper criteria for the assessment of the output of the schools; however, most schools unfortunately, consider a perusal of the average test scores to constitute an evaluation of the school. Some school systems and States have even published local norm tables for various achievement tests with the bald statement that the norms were to be used to evaluate the quality of the schools without any recognition of the fact that the schools differed greatly in size, expenditure, staff, and facilities, and that they were educating students who differed greatly in their socio-economic status, family background, ability, motivation, and past preparation. Rarely have evaluations of schools been based on a sound research design which controlled in some way the variations in the characteristics of the school and the student body so that sensible comparisons between schools could be made.

It is evident that only when such controls are used should there be an attempt to proceed to investigate the effect of the treatment variables, those characteristics of the schools which are thought to enhance educational attainment.

Of all the studies of school quality done in the past few are worth reporting. One of the better research studies has been the New York Quality Measurement Project. This project, started back in 1957 by the Division of Research of the New York State Education Department, selected 103 schools throughout the State for longitudinal investigation. I.Q. data were collected and various grades were tested for three consecutive years with a battery of achievement tests. Some limited school data were also collected on school size, socio-economic level, type of community, staff, and teacher training. Mort's "The Growing Edge," an instrument for measuring the adaptability of a school, the degree to which a school employs modern instructional techniques, was also used as a criterion measure. Schools were then grouped by socio-economic level and community type for comparisons and separate norm tables were derived for these groups.

In this study a school's effectiveness in teaching the basic skills, measured by standardized achievement tests, was assessed by comparing its test results to those of other similar schools. After grouping the schools by communities which had similar characteristics there were, of course, still great differences in the educational attainment within each group. Also there were great differences in the expenditures of the schools. The amount of money spent by a school is only a rough measure of its quality level, and so it is easy to find schools with high expenditures which do not produce students with high achievement and similarly, we can find efficient low expenditure schools which turn out students with high achievement. In the New York study it was found, on closer examination, that the relative effectiveness of a school system varies with the I.Q. score of the student, the socio-economic level of the student, the subject matter content, and sex of the student. It is not simply a matter of one school being better than another, rather it is that one school does a better job with a particular type of student in a certain subject matter area. Schools have strengths and weaknesses in specific areas and are not simply universally good or bad.

One wishes, however, that more comprehensive input data on the students and school characteristics had been available in the New York study so that the analysis could be further refined. For then students could be grouped, or controlled, by home background, attitudes toward school, etc. After having controlled student input we could go on to investigate and try to discover the important school characteristics which influence the attainment of the students.

I might mention, as an aside, that such comprehensive data is available in the Project TALENT Data Bank from their large 1960 study. Also the Iowa Educational Information Center is now starting to collect interlocked comprehensive data on schools, including student home background data, test scores, teacher data and school data, which could be used in studies of school quality.

Two major studies of school quality underway at the present are worth mentioning. One is the Carnegie Assessment Project which is now in the stage of developing testing instruments to be used in a nationwide study to measure the wider outcomes of the schools. The other study is the Pennsylvania Quality Education Project which is now nearing completion. This is an exploratory attempt to develop criteria of school quality and to assess measures and indices of these criteria.

I would now like to turn to the effort of the U.S. Office of Education in the measurement of Educational Quality. The National Center for Educational Statistics is now in the midst of conducting the "Educational Opportunities Survey" as required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This fall almost a million school children, from Grades 1 through 16, will participate in a major study which will collect comprehensive data on the students, including their home backgrounds, attitudes, ability levels in several basic skills, their teachers, and their schools. The data from this study are intended to do triple duty. They will fulfill the primary purpose of surveying the lack of equal educational opportunity for children of minority groups, they will, we hope, be a source of invaluable data for other educational researchers, and they will provide another needed set of basic data to the Division of Operations Analysis. This Division, within the National Center, is now in the process of developing a mathematical model of educational attainment. The basic plan for this effort is to identify the pertinent variables, those school characteristics which affect educational attainment, and to determine their relative importances, controlling, of course, on student input variables and certain school characteristics. Having found these pertinent variables we intend to ascribe costs to them and finally to determine by linear programming the optimum allocation of available funds for the maximization of educational attainment.

Cost and quality are often discussed together. As I mentioned earlier, high expenditure does not insure quality in a school. It is evidently the judicious use of funds on factors contributing to the educational attainment of the student which is of import. It would be of great value to the Office of Education if we could determine the relative effects of various possible alternatives for improving school quality. (And here we intend to use the concept of school efficiency as a measure of school quality.) For then we could make our decisions on the basis of the

most efficient alternative which would give us the maximum educational output for a given resource or dollar expenditure.

In summary, the path ahead in the measurement of school quality leads to the very simple realization that in order to do this properly we must first specify our goals and determine the appropriate criterion measures, then we must con-

trol on relevant student and school characteristics. Also, because of the wide organizational variations in the schools throughout the Nation it is advantageous to group the schools by geographic region, type of school, school size, tax base, or any other meaningful classification. By using such a procedure we can reasonably expect to improve our assessment of the schools.