

Home > Journal > Social Sciences & Humanities > CE

[Indexing](#) [View Papers](#) [Aims & Scope](#) [Editorial Board](#) [Guideline](#) [Article Processing Charges](#)

CE > Vol.3 No.6, October 2012

OPEN ACCESS

Using Process Indicators to Facilitate Data-Driven Decision Making in the Era of Accountability

PDF (Size: 127KB) PP. 685-691 DOI : 10.4236/ce.2012.36102

Author(s)

Kyu Tae Kim

ABSTRACT

This paper explores which accountability indicators are likely to reveal the distinct contexts and qualitative characteristics of school that stimulate and improve authentic pedagogy and accountability. In the era of accountability, data-driven decision making is a new research area for authentic pedagogy through monitoring student progress and improving school accountability. It is based on input-and-result oriented indicators such as school demographics, facilities, budget, standardized test scores, dropout rates. But the indicators are unlikely to capture a dynamically interactive qualitative characteristics of school organizations featuring a loosely-coupled system and difficult to be measured or assessed. Thus, process indicators need to be complementary to input-and-outcome data for a valid and graphic description, monitoring and explanation of ' why ' and ' how ' the school outcomes occur. The author concluded that the data-driven decision making (DDDM) based on process indicators strengthens reflective professionalism and provides for the educational welfare for the poor and left-behind students.

KEYWORDS

Data-Driven Decision Making; Process Indicator; Educational Accountability; Transparency; Educational Policy

Cite this paper

Kim, K. (2012). Using Process Indicators to Facilitate Data-Driven Decision Making in the Era of Accountability. *Creative Education*, 3, 685-691. doi: 10.4236/ce.2012.36102.

References

- [1] Abelmann, C., & Elmore, R. (1999). When accountability knocks, will anyone answer? Consortium for Policy Research in Education, ERIC ED 428463.
- [2] Adams, J. E., & Kirst, M. (1999). New demands for educational accountability: Striving for results in an era of excellence. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research in educational administration* (pp. 463-489, 2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [3] Anderson, G. L. (2009). *Advocacy leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education*. New York: Routledge.
- [4] Berry, B., Fuller, E., Reeves, C., & Laird, E. (2006b). Linking teachers and student data to improve teacher and teaching quality. URL (last checked 18 March 2010). <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.com>.
- [5] Cindy, H., & Joellen, K. (2007). Ten roles for teacher leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65, 74-77.
- [6] Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 375-395. doi:10.3102/01623737025004375
- [7] Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers college Record*, 91, 59-80.

- [Open Special Issues](#)
- [Published Special Issues](#)
- [Special Issues Guideline](#)

[CE Subscription](#)

[Most popular papers in CE](#)

[About CE News](#)

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[Recommend to Peers](#)

[Recommend to Library](#)

[Contact Us](#)

Downloads: 195,411

Visits: 428,738

Sponsors, Associates, and Links >>

- [The Conference on Information Technology in Education \(CITE 2012\)](#)

- [8] Darling-Hammond, L., & Ball, D. L. (1999). What can policy do to support teaching to high standards? CPRE Policy Bulletin. URL (last checked 30 June 2008). http://www.cpre.org/Publications/Publications_Policy_Bulletins.htm
- [9] Data Quality Campaign (2006). Creating a longitudinal data system: Using data to improve student achievement. URL (last checked 18 March 2012). <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.com>
- [10] Data Quality Campaign (2009). The next step: Using longitudinal data systems to improve student success. URL (last checked 18 March 2010). <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.com>
- [11] Day, C. (2002). School reform and transition in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 667- 692. doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00065-X
- [12] Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- [13] Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (2000). *Doing educational administration: A theory of administrative practice*. New York: Pergamon.
- [14] Firestone, W. A., & Herriott, R. E. (1982). Two images of schools as organizations: An explication and illustrative empirical test. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 18, 39-59. doi:10.1177/0013161X82018002004
- [15] Fusarelli, L. D. (2002). Tightly coupled policy in loosely coupled systems: Institutional capacity and organizational change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 561-575. doi:10.1108/09578230210446045
- [16] Gaither, G., Nedwek, B. P., & Neal, J. E. (1995). Measuring up: The promises and pitfalls of performance indicators in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No 5. ERIC ED 383278.
- [17] Greenfield, T. B. (1986). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. *Interchange*, 17, 57-80. doi:10.1007/BF01807469
- [18] Greenfield, T. B. (1991). Reforming and revaluing educational administration: Whence and when cometh the phoenix? *Educational Management and Administration*, 19, 200-217.
- [19] Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- [20] Habermas, J. (1996). Three normative models of democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [21] Hargreave, A., & Goodson, I. F. (1996). Teachers' professional lives: Aspirations and actualities. In I. F. Goodson, & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teachers professional lives* (pp. 1-27). London: Farmer Press.
- [22] Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed school leadership: Developing tomorrow' s leaders*. New York: Routledge.
- [23] Honig, M. J., & Coburn, C. (2008). Evidence-based decision making in school district central offices: Toward a policy and research agenda. *Educational Policy*, 22, 578-608. doi:10.1177/0895904807307067
- [24] Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill: New York.
- [25] Jones, B. D. (2007). The unintended outcomes of high-stakes testing. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 23, 65-86. doi:10.1300/J370v23n02_05
- [26] Knapp, M. S. (2008). How can organizational and sociocultural learning theories shed light on district instructional reform? *American Journal of Education*, 114, 521-539. doi:10.1086/589313
- [27] Lachat, M. A., & Smith, S. (2005). Practices that support data use in urban high schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 10, 333-349. doi:10.1207/s15327671espr1003_7
- [28] Laird, E. (2006b). Data use drives schools and district improvement. URL (last checked 18 March 2010). <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.com>
- [29] Lima, J. A. (2007). Teachers' professional development in departmentalised, loosely coupled organisations: Lessons for school improvement from a case study of two curriculum department. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18, 273-301. doi:10.1080/09243450701434156

- [30] Linn, R. L. (2001). The design and evaluation of educational assessment and accountability. CSE Technical Reprint 539. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standard, and Student Testing.
- [31] Loeb, H., Knapp, M. S., & Efers, A. (2008). Teachers' response to standards-based reform: Probing reform assumptions in Washington State. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 16, 1-32.
- [32] Louis, K. S., Kruse, S., & Raywid, M. A. (1996). Putting teachers at the center of reform: Learning schools and professional community. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80, 9-21. doi:10.1177/019263659608058003
- [33] Mansbridge, J. (1990). The rise and fall of self-interest in the explanation of political life. In Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond self-interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [34] Marsh, J. A., Pane, J. F., & Hamilton, L. S. (2006). Making sense of data-driven decision making in education: Evidence from recent RAND research. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. URL (last checked 28 November 2009). http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/OP170/
- [35] Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Rigdon, M. (1997). Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 41-74.
- [36] Oakes, J. (1989). What educational indicators? The case for assessing the school context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11, 181-199.
- [37] O' Day, J. A. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72.
- [38] Ogawa, R. T., & Collom, E. (2000). Using performance indicators to hold schools accountable: Implicit assumptions and inherent tensions. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 200-215. doi: 10.1207/S15327930PJE7504_9
- [39] Opper, V. D., Henry, G. T., & Mashburn, A. J. (2008). The district effect: Systemic response to high stakes accountability policies in six southern states. *American Journal of Education*, 114, 299-332. doi: 10.1086/521242
- [40] Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009). Co-constructing distributed leadership: District and school connections in data-driven decision-making. *School Leadership and Management*, 29, 477-494. doi: 10.1080/13632430903162541
- [41] Petty, N. W., & Green, T. (2006). Measuring educational opportunity as perceived by students: A process indicator. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18, 67-91. doi: 10.1080/09243450601104750
- [42] Popham, W. J. (2001). *The truth about testing: An educator's call in action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [43] Porter, A. C. (1991). Creating a system of school process indicators. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13, 13-29.
- [44] Ranson, S. (2003). Public accountability in the age of neo-liberal government. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18, 459-480. doi: 10.1080/0268093032000124848
- [45] Reyes, P., Wagstaff, L. H., & Fusarelli, L. D. (1999). Delta forces: The changing fabric of American society and education. In J. Murphy, & K. S. Louse, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 183-202, 2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [46] Rothstein, R. (2000). Toward a composite index of school performance. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100, 409-441. doi: 10.1086/499649
- [47] Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- [48] Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). *Foundations of program evaluation: Theory of practice*. New York: Sage publications.
- [49] Sheldon, K. M., & Biddle, B. J. (1998). Standards, accountability, and school Reform: Perils and pitfalls. *Teacher College Record*, 100, 164-180.
- [50] Skyes, G. (1999). The new professionalism in education: An appraisal. In J. Murphy, & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research in educational administration* (pp. 203-226, 2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [51] Spillane, J. P. (2004). State, standard, assessment, and accountability instruments in practice: When

the rubber hits the road. URL (last checked 2 May 2009). <http://www.albany.edu/edfin/Spillane%20EFRC%20Symp%2004%20Single.pdf>

- [52] Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36, 3-34. doi:10.1080/0022027032000106726
- [53] Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- [54] Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M., Pustejovsky, J., Pareja, A. S., & Lewis, G. (2008). Taking a distributed perspective: Epistemological and methodological tradeoffs in operationalizing the leader-plus aspect.