



PROCEEDING

SIEC 2014

SILIWANGI INTERNATIONAL
ENGLISH CONFERENCE

“ENGLISH TEACHERS
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT”

November 27 - 28th, 2014
Mandala Building, Universitas Siliwangi
Jl. Siliwangi No. 24 Tasikmalaya

UNIVERSITAS SILIWANGI

ENGLISH



SIEC

**SILIWANGI INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH CONFERENCE
PROCEEDINGS**

“English Teachers Professional Development”

27th – 28th of November 2014

University of Siliwangi, Tasikmalaya

Editors:

Rahmat

Metty Agustine Primary

Nuraeni

Yusup Supriyono

Junjun Muhamad Ramdani

Arini Nurul Hidayati

Asri Siti Fatimah

Cover Design by:

Inspire Multimind

**SILIWANGI INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH CONFERENCE 2014
PROCEEDINGS**

“English Teachers Professional Development”

ISBN: 978-602-71577-0-5

Copyright ©2014 by English Education Department UNSIL Press

All right reserved. No part of this publication may be produced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of English Education Department, University of Siliwangi.

Jl. Siliwangi No.24 Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia

Phone: (0265) 323532 englishkip@unsil.ac.id

Published by:

English Education Department UNSIL Press

Jl. Siliwangi No.24 Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia

Phone : (0265) 323532

Email : englishkip@unsil.ac.id

Website : www.eng.unsil.ac.id

DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING FOR ELT CURRICULUM INNOVATION

Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari

m.f.ansyari@uin-suska.ac.id; muhammadfauzanansyari@yahoo.com

Faculty of Education and Teacher Training
UIN Suska Riau

Abstract

Internal evaluation which is usually seen as synonymous with 'self-evaluation' is necessary for school improvement. In English Language Teaching, it is an important component for ensuring qualities of ELT curricula in schools, evaluated by internal stakeholders within decentralized school system in particular. Since schools are so autonomous that they have a greater degree of self-direction in a decentralised education, they are accountable for their educational practices; they are required to internally evaluate the quality of the education, including curricula. In the present age especially in a decentralized educational system, internal evaluation is playing increasingly important role in such system. However, the statement whether it is more important than external evaluation in the context of ELT has not been much debated in literature. This paper will discuss theoretical underpinning of internal evaluations to ensure validity, practicality, relevance, and effectiveness of ELT curricula in schools that have fundamentally beneficial influences on ELT practices.

Key words: *Data-based decision making; internal evaluation; curriculum; English Language Teaching*

INTRODUCTION

Internal evaluation which is usually seen as synonymous with 'self-evaluation' (MacBeath & McGlynn, 2002) is necessary for school improvement. It is aimed at evaluating the quality and effectiveness of internal processes (effectiveness of individual activities, styles, methods and forms of work, individual teachers) as well as external conditions (from the view point of the school) that lead to the fulfillment of aims stated by the school on the basis of its educational policy assignment (Zufanova, 2006, p. 36-37). Furthermore, Maes, Eecke, and Verhaegen (2006) define it as a process undertaken by the school, in which staff systematically gather and analyze evidence, including feedback from a range of stakeholders, and use it to assess and evaluate aspects of the school performance against agreed standards (p. 80). Thus, internal evaluation is an

important component for ensuring their quality and effectiveness, evaluated by internal stakeholders within decentralized school system in particular.

Since schools are so autonomous that they have a greater degree of self-direction in a decentralised education, they are accountable for their educational practices; they are required to internally evaluate the quality of the education. Therefore, internal evaluations are crucial and become inevitable parts of school improvement (Devos & Verhoeven, 2003b; McNamara & O'Hara, 2005; Vanhoof & Van Petegem, 2011).

In the present age especially in a decentralized educational system, internal evaluation is playing increasingly important role in such system. However, the statement whether it is more important than external evaluation has sparked much debate. Some people argue that internal evaluations have fundamentally beneficial influences on schools while the others contend that external evaluations are more objective for evaluating school accountability. This paper will discuss theoretical underpinning of internal evaluations to ensure validity, practicality, relevance, and effectiveness of ELT curricula in schools that have fundamentally beneficial influences on ELT practices.

1. Classifying ELT curriculum evaluation

Built on the work by West and Hopkins (1998) as cited by Scheerens, the author argues that curriculum evaluation could be based on three different orientations: evaluation of curriculum innovation, evaluation for curriculum innovation, and evaluation as curriculum innovation.

The first qualification, *evaluation of curriculum innovation*, refers to the results of curriculum innovation efforts. This is therefore intended prove the quality of the curriculum (summative). The second qualification, *evaluation for curriculum innovation*, is meant to improve the quality of the curriculum innovation (formative). This evaluation is conducted during the curriculum innovation processes. Finally, *evaluation as curriculum innovationis* oriented to improve the

quality of the evaluation itself and teacher professional development. Scheerens argued that the evaluation and improvement processes are one and the same, and action research best expresses this orientation. He further explained that it is exploiting the reflexive potential of the evaluation processes. In reality, curriculum development and teacher development are inseparable because an effort to improve curriculum in many cases ends up with improving teachers as well or vice versa, and may finally lead to school improvement.

With regard to curriculum evaluation, Nieveen (1999) identified four qualities of a curriculum as specified in the table 1 below. Of the four qualities, only effectiveness serves as the evaluation of curriculum innovation.

Table 1: Curriculum qualities

Validity/relevance	There is a need for the intervention and its design is based on state-of-the art (scientific) knowledge
Consistency	The structure of the curriculum is logical and cohesive
Practicality	<i>Expected practicality</i> It is expected that the intervention is usable in the settings for which it has been designed
	<i>Actual practicality</i> The intervention is usable in the settings for which it has been designed
Effectiveness	<i>Expected effectiveness</i> Using the intervention is expected to result in desired outcomes

	<p><i>Actual effectiveness</i></p> <p>The implementation of the intervention leads to the desired outcomes</p>
--	--

2. Data-based decision making

Schildkam and Kuiper (2010) defined data-driven decision making as a systematic analysis on existing data sources and apply the results of the analyses to innovate teaching, curricula, and school performance, and, implement and evaluate these innovations (p, 482). Decision making should therefore be based on available and accessible data to ensure that the innovation could be achieved and sustained. Evaluating curriculum products, such as textbook, is conducted with any available and accessible data related current theories for textbook development, contents, context, student prior knowledge, etc.

3. Warrants and risks related to internal evaluation

It is undeniable to say that both internal and external evaluations have both strengths and weaknesses which must be addressed accordingly. To begin with, internal evaluation could be a basis for external evaluation (Devos & Verhoeven, 2003b). In several cases, although not all components are used, internal evaluation becomes a necessary part of external evaluation done by inspectorates. This indicates that internal evaluation should be first made available before external evaluation.

Moreover, internal school staffs know better than anyone else about their environment, educational practices, resources, etc. This means, internal evaluation would possibly take all relevant data into account as to fully capture the nature of the evaluation. On the other hand, according to Coleman and Collinge as cited by Macbeath (1999), classroom observations by visiting auditors fail to touch the real day-to-day experiences of children and their teachers. This is because the external evaluators are not always available at schools (Conley-Tyler, 2005) so that they would be unlikely to capture and understand all processes. This also indicates that external evaluation would be generally in quantitative while internal evaluation serves both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

Furthermore, Conley-Tyler (2005) mentions several other issues about internal evaluation: the cost for internal evaluators is likely less than for external ones; have first-hand knowledge of the organisation's philosophy, policies, procedures, personnel and management; have an understanding of cultural and political factors that affect the operating environment of the organisation being evaluated; and they are more flexible. However, external evaluators are more able to collect information that might be difficult to obtain; they have skills and expertise; and, they are more objective. With regard to evaluation competency, internal evaluators' expertise can be improved through in-service training and working in partnership with more knowledgeable others, such as universities.

Another important issue is that internal evaluation improves decision making process at the level of the school and of the local educational system (Friedman & Golan-Cook, 2002). This advocates that decision making is based on the involvement of the players in the schools, and this will increase their responsibility and awareness in the implementation of such policy made. When top-down approach is adopted, for example, change fails to happen (Hopkins, 2005) because teachers only make use of what they think useful. Also, internal evaluation serves as a means of promoting reflection and empowers individuals and organizations engaged in the evaluation process (Friedman & Golan-Cook, 2002). As teachers are engaged in the evaluation, they are required to look at what have been done right and wrong and find out why such things went wrong. At the end they will construct their knowledge based on their own experiences. Moreover, internal evaluation promotes evaluation for accountability, and can be a basis for dialogue with external authorities (Friedman & Golan-Cook, 2002). In addition, it develops an evaluation language, and enhances school's reputation in the eyes of external functionaries (Friedman & Golan-Cook, 2002).

In addition, the case for internal evaluation is made on the grounds of ownership; therefore, the greater the sense of belonging the more likely the chance of success (MacBeath & McGlynn, 2002). It can be argued internal evaluation will lead to ownership which is fundamental for successful change whereas external

evaluation will be unlikely to establish such ownership because of the absence of teachers and other internal staff engagement. MacBeath and McGlynn (2002) also advocate that internal evaluation need not disrupt normal patterns of working. It can be an integral part of school life, embracing key aspects of a school's work, focusing on what matters most to teachers, pupils and parents. It means that internal evaluation should not be conducted inseparable with school daily practices, and it can take both formative and summative in nature. This integration would result in time and money efficiency as teachers, for instance, teach regularly and at the same time collect and analyze data for the sake of internal evaluation.

Finally, if evaluation of schools will support school development and increase school quality, self-evaluation is the best way to start with (Buhren, 2002, p. 279). And, the significance of both internal and external evaluation should not be seen in isolation, but in integration because one should complement the other (Nevo, 1998, 2001, 2002; van Petegen, 2009).

REFERENCES

- Buhren, C. G. (2002). School evaluation in Germany: A means to improve school quality. In D. Nevo (Ed.), *School-based evaluation: An international perspective* (Vol. 8, pp. 261-279). Oxford: Elsevier Science, Ltd.
- Conley-Tyler, M. (2005). A fundamental choice: internal or external evaluation? *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 4(1 & 2), 3-11.
- Devos, G., & Verhoeven, J. C. (2003a). School self-evaluation--Conditions and caveats the case of secondary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 31(4), 403-420.
- Devos, G., & Verhoeven, J. C. (2003b). School self-evaluation—Conditions and caveats: The case of secondary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 31(4), 403-420. doi: 10.1177/0263211X030314005
- Friedman, E., & Golan-Cook, P. (2002). Israel: Internal self-evaluation as a means for generating change. In D. Nevo (Ed.), *School-based evaluation: An international perspective* (Vol. 8, pp. 219-242). Oxford: Elsevier Science, Ltd.
- Hopkins, D. (2005). Tensions in and prospects for school improvement. In D. Hopkins (Ed.), *The practice and theory of school improvement: International handbook of educational change* (pp. 1-21). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Huffman, D., & Kalnin, J. (2003). Collaborative inquiry to make data-based decisions in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 569-580.
- I-Probc. (n.d). Self-evaluation, Create a mirror for your school Retrieved 3 December 2011, from <http://www.I-Probe.net>
- Ingram, D., K, S. L., & Schroeder, R. G. (2004). Accountability policies and teacher decision making: Barriers to the use of data to improve practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1258-1287.
- Macbeath, J. (1999). *Schools must speak for themselves: The case for school self-evaluation*. London: Routledge.
- MacBeath, J., & McGlynn, A. (2002). *Self-evaluation: What's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Maes, B., Eecke, E. V., & Verhaegen, V. (2006). On the balance between internal and external evaluation in a number of European educational systems. In P. Dobbelsstein & T. Neidhardt (Eds.), *Schools for quality-What data-based approaches can contribute* (pp. 77-102). Belgium: Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE).
- McNamara, G., & O'Hara, J. (2005). Internal review and self-evaluation — the chosen route to school improvement in Ireland? *Studies In Educational Evaluation, 31*(4), 267-282. doi: 10.1016/j.studuc.2005.11.003
- McNamara, G., & O'Har, J. (2008). The importance of the concept of self-evaluation in the changing landscape of education policy. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 34*, 173-179.
- Nevo, D. (1998). Dialogue evaluation: a possible contribution of evaluation to school improvement. *Prospects, 28*(1), 77-89. doi: 10.1007/bf02737781
- Nevo, D. (2001). School evaluation: internal or external? *Studies In Educational Evaluation, 27*(2), 95-106. doi: 10.1016/s0191-491x(01)00016-5
- Nevo, D. (2002). Dialogue evaluation: Combining internal and external evaluation. In D. Nevo (Ed.), *School-based evaluation: An international perspective* (Vol. 8, pp. 3-15). Oxford: Elsevier Science, Ltd.
- Nieveen, N. (1999). Prototyping to reach product quality. In J. van den Akker, R. M. Branch, K. Gustafson, N. Nieveen & T. Plomp (Eds.), *Design approaches and tools in education and training* (pp. 125-135). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Preskill, H., & Torres, R. T. (1999). Building capacity for organizational learning through evaluative inquiry. *Evaluation, 5*(1), 42-60.
- Schereen, J. (2002). School self-evaluation: origins, definition, approaches, methods and implementation. In D. Nevo (Ed.), *School-based evaluation: an international perspective* (pp. 35-69). Kidlington, Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Schildkamp, K., & Kuiper, W. (2010). Data-informed curriculum reform: Which data, what purposes, and promoting and hindering factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 482-496.
- Schildkamp, K., & Teddlie, C. (2008). School performance feedback systems in the USA and in The Netherlands: a comparison. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 14*(3), 255-282. doi: 10.1080/13803610802048874
- Schildkamp, K., & Visscher, A. (2010). The utilisation of a school self-evaluation instrument. *Educational Studies, 36*(4), 371-338.

- van Petegen, P. (2009). *Internal and external evaluation of schools: Two sides of the coin called quality assurance of education*. Paper presented at the Key note address delivered at the Annual Conference of the All India Association for Educational research, Lucknow, India.
- Vanhoof, J., & Petegem, P. V. (2010). Evaluating the quality of self-evaluations: The (mis)match between internal and external meta-evaluation. *Studies In Educational Evaluation*, 36, 20-26.
- Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2011). Designing and evaluating the process of school self-evaluations. *Improving Schools*, 14(2), 200–212. doi: 10.1177/1365480211406881
- Zufanova, H. (2006). On the meaning of internal and external evaluation for the quality of education during educational reforms. In P. Dobbstein & T. Neidhardt (Eds.), *Schools for quality-What data-based approaches can contribute* (pp. 35-56). Belgium: Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE).



English Education Department, UNSIL Press
Jl.Siliwangi No.24 Tasikmalaya, West Java, Indonesia
Phone : (0265) 323532
Email : englishfkip@unsil.ac.id
Website : www.eng.unsil.ac.id



ENGLISH

