There are a variety of pivotal monograph resources on formative and summative evaluation. However, there is only one resource on confirmative evaluation that addresses continuing efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, value, and alignment: *Confirmative Evaluation: Practical Strategies for Valuing Continuous Improvement* (Dessinger and Moseley, 2003). Evaluators need to seamlessly add confirmative evaluation to their repertoire of knowledge and skills. Dessinger and Moseley's book is an on-the-job guide for planning and conducting confirmative evaluation to evaluate performance-improvement interventions three to twelve months after implementation.

EVALUATION MODELS

Evaluation models are blueprints for guiding and making evaluation decisions. Many of the models that are often applied within the HPT framework actually come from the Educational Technology (ET) or Instructional Systems Development (ISD) arenas and may be adapted to both training and nontraining interventions by creative HPT practitioners. The HPT practitioner benefits from a general understanding of the various models reported here along with an eclectic approach to their use and value.

Curriculum Evaluation Models

The literature reports a variety of curriculum evaluation models. Tyler, Provus, Hammond, Papham, Taba, Bloom, and others have followed the "straightforward procedure of letting the achievement of objectives determine success or failure and justify improvements, maintenance, or termination of program activities" (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen, 2004, p. 80). Scriven and Komoski support a consumer-oriented approach using varieties of criterion checklists and product testing to address the consumer information needs of audiences, sponsors, clients, and stakeholders (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen, 2004, pp. 100–111). Eisner suggests expertise evaluation where professional judgments of quality are required. Individuals such as Stake, Patton, Guba, Lincoln, and so on are participant-oriented, use a pluralistic approach, and are concerned with description, judgment, and context (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen, 2004, pp. 129–151).

Training Evaluation Models

The literature also reports a variety of training evaluation models. The granddaddy of all is the Kirkpatrick Model. Kirkpatrick focuses on four levels of evaluation: level 1, participant reaction; level 2, participant learning; level 3, on-the-job change in behavior; and level 4, final results of the training

(Kirkpatrick, 1994). Kirkpatrick is referenced by Hale (2004) and other HPT practitioners in terms of evaluating both training and nontraining performance-improvement interventions.

Other models, such as the CIRO Model, Hierarchy Model, Bell System Model, Contingency Model, Behavioral Science Model, Xerox Model, IBM Evaluation Model, and Saratoga Institute Model, are rooted in Kirkpatrick's four levels. For more information on these models, see Moseley and Dessinger (1998, pp. 253–260).

Eclectic Models

There are models that are more eclectic and flexible in their approach to evaluation. They can be used both in training evaluation and in human performance technology evaluation. The Kaufman, Keller, Watkins Model suggests a five-level approach to interventions: level 1, inputs such as human, physical, and financial resources and reactions such as perceived acceptability and efficiency of methods, means, and processes; level 2, acquisition, mastery, and competence; level 3, application or utilization within the organization; level 4, organizational results; and level 5, societal outcomes focusing on client responsiveness, contributions, and payoffs (Van Tiem, Moseley, and Dessinger, 2004).

Brinkerhoff's Six-Stage Model evaluates needs and goals that trigger an intervention: the design that addresses responsiveness to needs and goals; operation or the installation and implementation of an intervention in relation to the needs and design; the learning that takes place when interventions are first used; the endurance and sustainability of the intervention over time; and the payoff or the return on investment from the successfully implemented interventions (Van Tiem, Moseley, and Dessinger, 2004).

Stufflebeam's CIPP Model delineates context or planning, input or structuring, process or implementing, and product or recycling. CIPP is a comprehensive approach to evaluating at all stages of program development (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen, 2004).

Full-Scope Evaluation: A Timely New Model

Unlike the models discussed previously, the Dessinger-Moseley Full-Scope Evaluation Model illustrates the benefits of integrating two processes, performance improvement and evaluation, in one iterative flow. The model blends formative, summative, confirmative, and meta evaluation into a seamless, iterative flow for making judgments about the continuing merit and worth of any performance-improvement intervention. Then the HPT practitioner skillfully diverts the flow into the mainstream HPT process, where it becomes part of, rather than a branch off of, the HPT process flow. The real scoop is that full-scope evaluation can be as deep and as wide as you and your stakeholders agree that it needs to be.