

Work Sheet for Guiding Principles for Evaluator’s Workshop—School Improvement Planning Case Study

Guiding Principle <i>Orienting question</i>	Alignment of Case Study to the Guiding Principles
Systematic Inquiry <i>To what extent are the methods and approach detailed in the case study representative of the principle of systematic inquiry?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used multiple methods of data collection and widely accepted analytical techniques (A1) • Not explicit on the level of scrutiny of the evaluation design and methods (A3) • Evaluation team explored potential issues with the evaluand, including over reliance on academic outcomes (A2) • As part of the initial planning meeting, it is presumed the evaluator covered the details of the methods and approach with the commissioner of the evaluation, although some state officials later questioned the methods selected (A3)
Competence <i>What competencies are required to conduct an evaluation in the context outlined in the case study?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear as to the extent of the evaluation team’s education, abilities, skills, and experiences (B1) • Unclear how cultural competence was demonstrated as a part of the evaluation (B2) • Lead evaluator had conducted state-level evaluations previously (B1, B3) • Lead evaluator anticipated an over reliance on academic outcomes might be an issue based on previous experience (B1)
Integrity/Honesty <i>At which points in the case study did the evaluator have the opportunity to demonstrate the integrity/honesty principle?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up-front negotiations occurred between the commissioners of the evaluation and the evaluation team (C1) • Evaluation team explained the evaluation plan and procedures to commissioners of the evaluation, but not to other relevant stakeholders (C1) • Evaluator offered further analyses to increase utilization and minimize potential impact of negative findings (C6) • Evaluation team reviewed findings with the SDOE lead associate, presumably briefing him or her on issues encountered in the evaluation (C5)
Respect for People <i>What are the ways that the evaluator demonstrates the respect for people principle in the case study?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation team obtained IRB/human subjects approval (D2) • Unclear if relevant stakeholders beyond state officials received any of the evaluation findings (D5) • Evaluator offered further analyses to increase utilization and minimize potential impact of negative findings (D3) • Communication of the evaluation findings appeared limited, and may not have included and valued all relevant stakeholders (D4)
Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare <i>What tensions are evident in the case study with respect to the evaluator’s responsibility for general and public welfare?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if stakeholders beyond state officials received any of the evaluation findings or how findings will be used (E3, E4) • Evaluation included interviews with those directly participating in and impacted by the initiative (E1) • Lead evaluator refrained from identifying poor performing schools not using technical assistance (E5) • The reporting method of a PowerPoint presentation to the group of state officials, followed by a written report that may have had limited circulation, may not have been sufficient (E3)