**Work Sheet for Guiding Principles for Evaluators Workshop—Rural Homeless Program Case Study**

Overall Question: What issues does an **internal evaluator** face in applying the Guiding Principles that might be different than an external evaluator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle</th>
<th>Alignment of Case Study to the Guiding Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Systematic Inquiry**                 | ☐ Used an evaluation design that seemed acceptable to federal agency for funding (A1)  
☐ Used statistical procedures appropriate for a repeated measures design (A1)  
☐ Evaluation questions and approach were developed in an agency proposal; these were not negotiated between an external evaluator and client (A2)  
☐ Presentations at national conferences have provided some opportunity for scrutiny of the evaluation design and methods (A3) |
| **Competence**                         | ☐ Evaluator had extensive community-based evaluation experience (B1)  
☐ Research assistant had extensive program experience working with the homeless population (B2)  
☐ Research assistant lived in rural area; could be considered to be aware of rural values and issues (B2) |
| **Integrity/Honesty**                  | ☐ Evaluation team explained the evaluation plan and procedures to program staff, but not to other relevant stakeholders (C1)  
☐ Research assistant was explicit about his advocacy for the homeless, although his ability to maintain objectivity could be challenged (C2, C4)  
☐ Balance between the research assistant’s personal experience and expertise and his objectivity have to be considered (C2, C4)  
☐ Evaluation team regularly conveyed preliminary data and findings to program staff and Advisory Council and facilitated their use for program improvement (C5) |
| **Respect for People**                 | ☐ Research assistant was embedded in the program and the community so he knew the context very well (D1)  
☐ Evaluation team obtained IRB/human subjects approval (D2)  
☐ Clients were compensated for their participation in the evaluation (D2)  
☐ Use of verbatim responses to the open-ended questions in the first report may have violated client confidentiality if program staff could identify respondents (D2)  
☐ No clients were on the Advisory Council or were included among stakeholders who receive the evaluation reports (D5) |
| **Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare** | ☐ No clients were included among stakeholders on the Advisory Council which received the evaluation reports (E1)  
☐ Evaluation team may not have been sufficiently careful in presenting the responses to the open-ended questions the first time if staff could determine the respondents’ identities (E3)  
☐ Evaluation team regularly presented preliminary data reports in user-friendly formats and attempted to engage stakeholders in program improvement (E3)  
☐ Program staff felt ownership of the data and findings (E3)  
☐ Presentations at national meetings could contribute to the body of knowledge about homeless programs (E5) |