

## Completed Case Study Work Sheet for *Guiding Principles for Evaluators Workshop*

Guiding Principle	Specific Issues or Questions Raised Related to Principle
<p><b>Systematic Inquiry</b> How are methods of participant selection important to the credibility of an evaluation? What about methods of data collection?</p>	<p>How were neighborhood residents as well as program participants included in evaluation activities? What procedures were established or used to assure systematic inclusion of those stakeholders' perspectives? How were focus group participants recruited (potential bias)? (related issues in sampling, field testing instruments, survey design) In what ways does the evaluation address potential weaknesses or criticisms of convenience in gathering data as opposed to systematic methods, documented in a work plan? How well does the evaluation design and its questions address the information needs of the funder and board?</p>
<p><b>Competence</b> How can you decide what dimensions of competence are relevant for an evaluation? What is cultural competence and how will you know its presence?</p>	<p>What elements of competence are brought into play here and what omissions (in competence) might be envisioned? How does cultural competence weigh with respect to (a) evaluation competence (evaluation knowledge, skills, experience—what do we assume from academic credentials and some relevant experience); (b) program competence (knowledge of policies, mission, staffing, and so on); and (c) social or environmental competence (understanding and appreciation of the social, economic, and political realities in this neighborhood/city/state)? For cultural competence, are language skills necessary? Are they sufficient? In what ways might competence be usefully or realistically judged from the eyes of the buyer of evaluation services?</p>
<p><b>Integrity/Honesty</b> How might the idea of integrity or honesty affect different stages of the evaluation?</p>	<p>What possible conflicts might arise from the evaluator's previous experience on the board? How can these be resolved or handled? What potential influences might be created by the graduate student's use of the evaluation for a Master's thesis and how could these be addressed? What mechanisms or agreements were (or might be) established to deal with potential conflicts or issues that might arise during the course of an evaluation like this one? Why wasn't an RFP issued and/or a written proposal used as the basis for explicitly establishing mutual expectations for the evaluation? How does this principle affect the inclusion of participants and residents (or ways in which they are included and supported) in the evaluation activities?</p>
<p><b>Respect for People</b> What are major ways of showing respect for people in an evaluation context?</p>	<p>How does this principle interact with the need for cultural competence? What about the apparently minimal inclusion of program participants in the evaluation activities, and how about the lack of inclusion of neighborhood residents who are not program participants? How does IRB approval indicate sufficient and appropriate respect for people (clients, staff, etc.) in this evaluation? For example, staff are not only informants but also collectors of surveys from participants. What issues of respect might arise regarding compensation for participation?</p>
<p><b>Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare</b> Are there limits to an evaluator's responsibilities for general and public welfare?</p>	<p>How does the planned dissemination meet these responsibilities, or what issues are raised in possibly not meeting them? How might the evaluation results negatively impact the neighborhood or residents and how might the evaluator (or board, funder) consider and address such risks (e.g., limiting access to health care for some or all residents; creating pedestrian or other traffic into the neighborhood of others from outside, who may or may not contribute to the neighborhood's well being or to residents' sense of safety)? What pressures or influences might be anticipated from the power/status relationships at work in this evaluation concerning, for example, participants in relation to staff; both in relation to board and funder; between board and funder?</p>