

Wednesday, November 1, 4:30 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.

SESSION 101: Presidential Strand Skill-building Workshop

Room: Lanai

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Groups on Independent Consulting and Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation

Technical Assistance Tools: What It Really Takes To Help Organizations Succeed with Outcome Measurement

Facilitator: Dawn Hanson Smart, The Evaluation Forum

Driven by the move toward greater accountability and the demands of the grantmakers and taxpayers, a considerable amount of effort has gone into training staff from nonprofit agencies, local government, and other organizations on how to measure their program outcomes. Evaluators need to think beyond training and consider how much and what kind of additional assistance is necessary for organizations to be successful in this work. If evaluators want to help organizations develop and sustain outcome measurement systems, they will need to learn additional techniques and use new tools in their work. This workshop focuses on technical assistance tools and methods used by independent consultants who provide training as well as technical assistance and consultation. Participants will have the opportunity to try out some of the tools using a case study and to share their own experiences and discuss what it takes to build true capacity within organizations for outcome-based evaluation.

SESSION 102: Demonstration

Room: Akaka

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Extension Education Evaluation

CYFERNet Evaluation: Navigating a Comprehensive On-line Resource for Evaluating Community-based Programs

Chair: Donna J Peterson, University of Arizona

Presenters: Donna J Peterson, University of Arizona
Sherry C Betts, University of Arizona
Lucinda S Richmond, University of Arizona
Mary S Marczak, University of Minnesota
Susan Scherffius Jakes, North Carolina State University

This interactive demonstration will walk participants through evaluation resources available on the CYFERNet website. The goal is to show how the Evaluation Guide, used in conjunction with other CYFERNet evaluation web resources, can assist in conducting a well-conceptualized evaluation of community-based programs in four outcome areas (child, youth, parent/family and community). Strengths of these resources include grounding in existing literature and practice, organization around theoretical frameworks, and the fact they have been peer reviewed. The resources contain: literature reviews of relevant indicators, suggested evaluation instruments, annotated bibliographies, links to related websites and scholarly journals, explanations of evaluation methods, and practical examples of evaluations. After this demonstration, participants will be able to share their knowledge and CYFERNet resources with others involved in community-based programs and evaluations. These resources have been effectively used by educators, researchers, parents, youth, agency staff, community members, human services and health care providers, students, and policymakers.

SESSION 103: Tech Talk

Room: Koko

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Computer Use in Evaluation

Software Solutions to Applied Research Problems

Chair: Jack A McKillip, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Increasingly, applied researchers have opportunities to utilize software programs, in addition to traditional statistical packages. Awareness of program features, poor documentation, and compatibility with statistical packages often introduce challenges to the adoption of new software. This session presents the how-to experiences and evaluative assessments of several software programs used by members of Applied Research Consultants. Software programs discussed are ArcView for geographic analysis, Remark Office for mechanizing data entry; Survey Solutions for development of Internet and e-mail surveys; and GET SAS for importing data files into SPSS.

Presenters: *Electronic Surveys with Survey Solutions*, Amy A Rogers, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Electronic surveying skills are quickly becoming essential for anyone involved in data collection and analysis. Because electronic surveying improves access to subjects and bypasses traditional data entry, generalizability, efficiency, and accuracy can be greatly improved. Survey Solutions by Pursues is software designed to simplify the process of conducting surveys electronically. Survey Solutions offers three main applications: website surveys, e-mail surveys, and disk by mail surveys. For all three applications, data is easily converted into the Access database where simple analyses and charts can be made. Although this new software has some bugs and flaws, the three applications are generally simple to use. The web surveys and interactive e-mail surveys, in particular, look professional and are simple to create. Survey Solutions is compatible with Microsoft products and is user friendly for any who are familiar with Microsoft products.

Analyzing Spatial Data with ArcView GIS, Chad S Briggs, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

The analysis of data that are arranged over space and time provides important clues to underlying spatial processes, distributions, relationships and patterns. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are available for users ranging in expertise for analyzing geographically referenced variables. ArcView is one such version of GIS. Using ArcView, with spatial statistical software like Crime Stat, it is possible to perform a variety of analyses such as centographic measures (central tendency), nearest neighbor analyses, spatial autocorrelation and regression, "hot spot" analyses and hierarchical clustering. Using these methods, researchers will be able to target geographical areas of need, design interventions around these areas and evaluate their interventions over both time and space.

Entering Data with Remark, Kenji Yamazaki, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Data entry is an essential part of any survey research. The more data you collect the more accurate conclusions you can derive. However, entering data by hand is time consuming, tedious, and prone to errors. Remark Office OMR solves many problems by mechanizing the data entry process. First, this application software allows you to make the survey form as needed for your research. Remark allows you to create multiple-paged and two-sided questionnaires so your survey style will not be restricted. The second strength of Remark is its compatibility with over 30 different software programs. You can easily convert scanned data into databases such as SPSS and Microsoft Excel. Remark offers the flexibility to allow researchers to make their own survey forms and finish data entry quickly and accurately.

Importing SAS Data Files into SPSS, Gigi Awad, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Get SAS is a program available within SPSS that converts SAS data files into an SPSS working data file. Get SAS allows one to retrieve user defined value labels within a SAS data set and apply them to an SPSS data dictionary. This SPSS feature makes it easier for a researcher to analyze a large data set that is only available in a SAS data base. GET SAS's utilization with a large institutional characteristics data set will be discussed. Also benefits and drawbacks of using GET SAS to transfer data files will be addressed.

Discussant: Jack A McKillip, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

SESSION 104: Multipaper

Room: Waimea

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design

Growth Curve and Hierarchical Linear Modeling

Chair: Matthijs Koopmans, Metis Associates Inc

Presenters: *Examining a Growth Curve Approach to Calculating Individual Client Change*, John W Gilford Jr, Macro International

In their 1995 study, Speer and Greenbaum noted the propensity for statistical methods based upon traditional pre-post research designs to underestimate clinical improvement rates. The present study seeks to apply, compare and discuss five statistical methods for determining individual client change. Four of the methods presented are pre-post score difference approaches while the fifth, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), employs a growth curve analysis approach to identifying client change. These five methods of analysis will be compared in a sample of 1,000 children

and adolescents receiving treatment for severe emotional disturbance. This study will discuss advantages, weaknesses and caveats related to the use of hierarchical linear modeling in detecting significant client change in addition to recommendations for use of each of the five analytical approaches. Implications for evaluating change rates in large-scale mental health outcome evaluations at the state and federal level will be discussed.

Antecedents of Adolescent Delinquent Behavior: Implications for Social Policy and Evaluation, Robert Alan Johnson, National Opinion Research Center

Using recently developed methods of multilevel growth curve analysis applied to six waves of panel data collected for a sample of adolescents in a large Midwestern city, this paper portrays alternative pathways or trajectories of the development of delinquent behavior -- including drug use, school misbehavior, vandalism, and theft -- between early and late adolescence. The focus is on identifying antecedents and warning signs of delinquency -- such as parental psychiatric disorders, stressful life events, social rejection, and failure in school -- as well as protective factors -- such as parental and teacher support, school and community involvement, and educational and counseling programs -- that can deter high-risk children from self-destructive developmental pathways. The design of this prospective study is unique in that approximately one-half of the sample adolescents have parents who were diagnosed with psychiatric disorders at the time of the baseline adolescent and parental interviews conducted in 1992. Since interventions with vulnerable children are critical to reducing the costs to society of delinquency and crime, this paper should be of interest to many evaluation researchers.

Assessment of Student Mathematics Achievement Over Time: The Effectiveness of Hierarchical Linear Models, Matthijs Koopmans, Metis Associates Inc

Are Hierarchical Linear Growth Models (HLM) an effective replacement of the traditional pretest-posttest designs in the assessment of student achievement over time? This paper explores the utility of HLM to assess the effects of enrollment in Title I-funded Basic Skills programs on the mathematics achievement of elementary and middle school students in a large urban public school district located in the Northeast of the US. The results of two analyses are reported. Analysis #1 fits a within subjects growth model using 1994 - 1996 CTB-Mathematics NCE data of 3,182 students (grades 2 - 10), with a between-schools model to adjust for variations in enrollment in Title I and bilingual programs. Analysis #2 compares the growth trajectories of 7,738 students (grades 3, 5, 6, and 8) enrolled in Basic Skills programs to those who are not, using HLM and a conventional pretest-posttest design. Advantages and drawbacks of HLM are discussed.

SESSION 105: Panel

Room: Niihau

Evaluation – What Kind of Profession Are We Anyway?

Chair: Midge Smith, University of Maryland

This session will examine several aspects of what we are as a profession and what we might become by asking about who we are (e.g., what types of individuals practice), what is central that binds us together (e.g., values, beliefs, goals), qualifications for practice, and how the profession measures up as a learning organization and sustainable community.

Panelists: *If Evaluation Were A Circus, Who Would Be Under the Tent?* Midge Smith, University of Maryland

The metaphor of a circus is used to describe different performers in the field of evaluation as truth seekers (provide valid and reliable answers about program effectiveness), acrobats (want to be truth seekers but are limited by resources), bunglers (want to be a truth seekers but lack needed skills), and hucksters (1. do/say whatever is necessary to please or 2. have agenda to promote rather than assessing program).

How Can We Call Ourselves a Profession If There Are No Qualifications for Practice?, Blaine Worthen, Utah State University

The requirements for a system to recognize qualifications to be an "evaluator" are examined. Challenges are listed and options presented for achieving progress toward achieving the status of a mature profession.

The Profession as a Learning Organization and Sustainable Community, Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico

The principles of the learning organization are used as a metaphor to describe the profession of evaluation in terms of how it may change to become a true community, sustainable over time by promoting its own and individual member growth and development.

What Binds Us Together? What Are Our Values, Beliefs, and Goals? I. Standards and Guiding Principles, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Western Michigan University

By definition, a profession must have standards of practice. The Program Evaluation Standards and AEA's Guiding Principles are examined in terms of where we are today in meeting those challenges and what needs to be done to contribute to the profession as a sustainable community.

What Binds Us Together? What Are Our Values, Beliefs, and Goals? II. Ethics, Michael Morris, University of New Haven

All professions espouse a code of ethics for judging member behavior. This presentation discusses the ethical challenges and what is necessary for the profession to become a sustainable community.

SESSION 106: Skill-building Workshop

Room: Hilo

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Evaluation Managers and Supervisors

Five Easy Steps for Developing Effective Presentations

Chair: Robert A Vito, Department of Health and Human Services

Presenters: Robert A Vito, Department of Health and Human Services
Deborah F Holmes, Department of Health and Human Services

"Presentations"--the sound of this word brings feelings of fear and anxiety to many of us. Without effective presentations, however, the message contained in our evaluation reports may not be heard or correctly interpreted. The key to successful presentations is to remember the needs of your audience. This session will provide participants with five easy steps to be used in developing and delivering effective presentations:

1. Get to know your audience and what they expect from you as a presenter
 2. Narrow the focus of your presentation
 3. Develop effective visuals to reinforce this focus
 4. Perfect your delivery technique to keep your presentation interesting
 5. Plan for those last minute electronic pitfalls--don't let technical difficulties kill an otherwise successful presentation
- A workshop format will be utilized that will include an opportunity for audience participation, and the illustration of examples from an evaluation report. A video will be shared to reinforce the importance of incorporating the presented concepts in your next participation. The audience will be asked to critique this video presentation and share their observations for discussion purposes. Handouts and an Internet web site containing useful resources for preparing presentation materials will be shared with attendees for future reference.

SESSION 107: Skill-building Workshop

Room: Puna

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation

A Practical Guide to Constructing and Using Theory of Change Models in Evaluations of Comprehensive Community Initiatives

Facilitator: Frederic B Glantz, Abt Associates Inc

Theory of change models are an essential tool in the evaluation of Comprehensive Community Initiatives. While the utility of these models is recognized by most evaluators, many evaluators lack the practical skills necessary to

construct these models with program staff. This skill-building workshop will teach evaluators how to conduct the necessary interviews with program staff. Developing a theory of change model with program staff requires program staff to think about their programs in new ways. This session will teach evaluators how to get program staff to think in terms of specific activities and how these activities are linked to specific quantifiable outcomes. It will teach evaluators how to get program staff to move beyond process to quantifiable indicators of goal achievement. The session will use practical examples from an ongoing cluster evaluation of an initiative designed to improve the quantity and quality of child care for low-income families through systemic change.

SESSION 108: Meta-demonstration

Room: Kohala

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation

Innovative Methods and Approaches to Instrument Development and Application in Cluster and Multi-site Evaluation

Chair: Astrid Hendricks-Smith, WK Kellogg Foundation

Presenters: *Evaluating Student Achievement in a Multi-site Implementation Evaluation of an Embedded Assessment System in a Hands-on Science Curriculum*, Ann Barter, University of California at Berkeley

This implementation evaluation is being conducted in the 1999/2000 academic school year with three sites (Sand Springs, Oklahoma, Louisville, Kentucky; and Cincinnati, Ohio) with multiple classrooms at each site. The paper will focus on one of the areas of interest in this implementation evaluation, that of student achievement. The first analysis will be a pre-post comparison over the course of the academic year in three groups. One, classes using the curriculum and the embedded assessment system. Two, classes using the curriculum only. And, three, traditional middle school science classes. In addition, data will be analyzed on student achievement throughout the year in the curriculum plus assessment system classrooms comparing student achievement for classrooms with teachers with more experience and teachers with less experience using the assessment system. The final comparison will be among the curriculum plus assessment system classes across the three sites.

Development of a Common Instrument for a Twelve-project Initiative, Mari R Kemis, Iowa State University; and S Kay Rockwell, University of Nebraska

The process of developing and testing a common instrument for use in a cluster evaluation will be described. The Food Systems Professions Education (FSPE) initiative, funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF) to examine and experiment with changes in food systems professions and institutional change in higher education, was supported by a cluster evaluation involving an external evaluator and evaluators from twelve projects based at land-grant institutions across the United States. The process consisted of forming a community of evaluators and building trust among them, agreeing upon a set of common indicators, developing instrumentation for various stakeholders and that would also address individual project needs, and pilot testing the instruments. Of key importance was the usefulness of the evaluation to individual projects, as well as to WKKF in examining and judging overall project impact. Lessons learned from this process will also be discussed.

Do Focus Group Interviews and Self-administered Questionnaires Tell the Same Story? Maria C Norton & Byron R Burnham, Utah State University

Focus group interviews (FGI) have become an increasingly popular method for obtaining qualitative data about programs. An alternative data collection tool, the self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) affords the participant a greater sense of anonymity and freedom to express true thoughts and feelings. Unfortunately, busy individuals may not have adequate time for careful reflection on the issues addressed by the often forced-options, structured SAQ. A potential weakness of FGIs is the potential for public conformity, especially for individuals with minority opinions, resulting in bias. To explore the question of consistency between FGI and SAQ, a validity study is being conducted as part of a cluster evaluation of a national initiative. We will compare the themes that emerge from FGI discussions to subsequent self-report questionnaire responses, in order to determine agreement, and identify moderator variables related to consistency, such as professional status, gender, and tenure within the program.

Discussant: Jeffrey Greene, Third Sector Strategies

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Evaluation Use

Contributions of Evaluation Utilization to Evaluation Capacity Building

Chair: Valerie J Caracelli, US General Accounting Office

The papers in this session are intended to explore the theoretical and conceptual linkages that link evaluation use with evaluation capacity building. The authors approach this task from a variety of perspectives. Contextual issues related to implementation and process use as conditions that facilitate or impede evaluation capacity building will be addressed. Also, recognition is given to the necessity for building meta-evaluation capacity. Key to building such capacity is that organizations identify and minimize evaluation misuse. Meta-evaluation capacity includes theory to define use and misuse, standards that address use, an ethical base of practice, clarity of role responsibilities, and cultural competence. Ethical concerns within the field of evaluation are brought to bear on the potential unforeseen consequences that may be concomitant with increasing the capacity of organizations to use evaluations. Questions about how evaluators situate themselves in relation to other stakeholders in use-based practice are examined. A case study provides an in-depth examination of evaluation as critical inquiry and the role of the evaluator as building the capacity for inquiry. Critical inquiry provides a mechanism for creating a collaborative and dialogic process where knowledge is produced through negotiation. Insightful and provocative commentary on the papers will be provided by discussants. The audience will be invited to further discuss the ideas presented and challenges they face in building evaluation capacity.

Panelists: *Conceptual Links between Evaluation Use and Capacity Building*, J Bradley Cousins, University of Ottawa

This paper explores conceptual links between evaluation utilization and evaluation capacity building domains of inquiry. The purpose of the paper is to contribute to the provision of conceptual clarity in the area. The expanding conception of utilization over the past decade is of particular interest. The emergent construct of process utilization is examined in relation to its implications and connection to evaluation capacity building. Consideration is given to contextual and evaluation implementation characteristics and conditions that lead to enhanced evaluation capacity building.

Building Capacity To Address Misuse of Evaluation, Karen E Kirkhart, Syracuse University

As organizations build evaluation capacity, capacity for meta-evaluation must be simultaneously cultivated. The need for meta-evaluation is clearly illustrated in the area of evaluation influence. To keep evaluation on track, organizations must identify and minimize evaluation misuse. This paper identifies and discusses some key ingredients in such meta-evaluation capacity: a theoretical framework to define use and misuse, standards for meta-evaluation that address use, an ethical base of practice, demarcation of role responsibilities, and cultural competence. The presentation is intended to stimulate discussion about evaluation misuse as well as capacity building.

Increasing Evaluation's Capacity for Mischief: An Ethical Issue? Michael Morris, University of New Haven

Michael Patton has hypothesized that "as [evaluation] use increases, misuse will also increase." To the extent this is true, increasing the capacity of organizations to use evaluations is a mixed blessing. Mischief is likely to walk in the door along with the invited guests. But is such mischief necessarily unethical, and even when we think it is, at what point do the evaluator's ethical responsibilities for use become secondary to those of other stakeholders? The paper will explore these issues within the context of existing research on evaluators' views of ethical concerns within the field.

Reconceptualizing Capacity-building as Critical Inquiry: A Case Study, Sharon Rallis, University of Connecticut; Gretchen B Rossman, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; and Gary T Henry, Georgia State University

When cast as critical inquiry, evaluation becomes a collaborative and dialogic process. Process participants explore

alternative perspectives within a social justice framework. Knowledge is produced through negotiation that considers the interests of all stakeholders. The role of the evaluator in the process is in building capacity for inquiry. The evaluator serves as a resource and teacher. This paper develops evaluation as critical inquiry through a case study from practice.

Discussant: Nick Tilley, Nottingham Trent University

SESSION 110: Demonstration

Room: Ewa

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Health Evaluation

Applying the Value Compass as an Evaluation Tool: Assessing the Value Added by Health Professions Education from the Community's Perspective

Chair: James R Boex, Northeastern Ohio Universities

Presenters: Carol Murry, Ke Ola O Hawaii
Ho'oiipo DeCambra, Wai'anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center

Significant support for community-based health professions education has been based on the assumption that there is a benefit to communities of training health professionals in them. Despite the recognition that multiple stakeholder perspectives need to be included in evaluation in general, community perspectives have seldom been included in these stakeholder discussions. Indicators of both costs and benefits to communities have typically been defined and assessed from an academic or professional, as opposed to broad community, perspective. Given that the number of community-based health professions educational initiatives is increasing, this issue is of growing importance. The value compass, originally developed to allow multifocal assessment of clinical care, has begun to be adapted to non-clinical evaluation uses. We will show how it can be applied to the problem above, and will also discuss its applications to a number of other evaluation situations. Participants will be given the opportunity to try to apply the compass to their evaluation situations.

SESSION 111: Skill-building Workshop

Room: Honolulu

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health

Consumers as Researchers: Tools for Incorporating Mental Health/Substance Abuse Treatment Consumers into the Evaluation Process

Chair: Debi Elliott, Portland State University

Presenters: Karen Cellarius, Portland State University
Jovita Wright, Portland State University
Edna Kimmons, Portland State University

Evaluators and consumers on a federal Substance Abuse, Mental Health, Traumatic Violence research project will lead a discussion on strategies for effectively incorporating consumers (and anyone new to research) into the research team. Consumers have a unique perspective that can help guide all aspects of the evaluation process. The discussion will include (1) a brief description of the culturally specific Kuumba ("creativity") Project and (2) elements of consumer involvement in Kuumba and other research, including: benefits to research, benefits to consumers, pathways and barriers to effective consumer involvement, as well as potential solutions to those barriers. Following the discussion, participants will be asked to complete a planning grid on how to involve consumers in all elements of a current or future evaluation project. If time allows, grids will then be reviewed and discussed.

SESSION 112: Alternative Format

Room: Kahuku

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group for Graduate Students

Third Annual Doctoral Roundtable: Dissertation Tricks and Treats

Chair: David J Bernstein, Montgomery County Department of Finance

Presenters: David J Bernstein, Montgomery County Department of Finance
Susan R Boser, Cornell University
James A Riedel, Girl Scouts of the USA
Katrina L Bledsoe, Claremont Graduate University

This is the Third Annual Doctoral Roundtable. This session will 1) provide information on developing and completing doctoral dissertations, and 2) encourage doctoral student, faculty, and recent post-doctorate networking. The first half of the session is a panel discussion by doctoral students, who will discuss "tricks and treats" of dissertation research, based on their experience and praxis. Potential topics include: using the dissertation for networking and career exploration; making a non-traditional dissertation lead to the career you want; long-distance dissertating; balancing client needs with the requirements of the dissertation committee; and financial and political aspects of doing a dissertation. The audience will be invited to provide comments by asking questions (a doctoral trick) and participate throughout. The second half of the session will include small group/breakout discussions to allow participants to discuss their own dissertation challenges and interests. Faculty, students, and recent post-doctorates are invited to participate.

SESSION 113: Think Tank

Room: Oahu

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Minority Issues in Evaluation

Harvesting the Wisdom of Many Voices: Facilitating Program Effectiveness, Empowerment and Success

Chair: Hazel L Symonette, University of Wisconsin at Madison

Explore the uses of evaluation tools and techniques as diagnostic resources for critical reflection, empowered improvement initiatives, accountability and strategic image management: a capacity-building process. Facilitate networking and conversations that start in the Think Tank and then continue throughout the conference. The symposium aims to examine ways that we--with our evaluation tools and techniques--can be of service to and within communities of color, as well as other underrepresented and underserved communities. We will lay the groundwork with a series of mini-presentations on program logic models; holistic, culturally-grounded evaluation approaches; participatory and collaborative approaches; and diverse evaluator roles. Using a modified open space technology model, we will spin off into small-group clusters for more intensive exploration. Ideally, these small groups will touch base periodically during the conference and then "reconvene" briefly during part of the Minority Issues business meeting on Friday, 1:50-3:20pm.

Facilitators: *Using Program Logic Models to Demystify and Make Evaluation Work for Program Staff and Participants*, Ricard Millett & Astrid Hendricks-Smith, W K Kellogg Foundation

Overview the demystification power and the capacity-building and participation-engagement utility of program logic models, using the new Kellogg Foundation resource document. {A prelude to a more intensive 90 minute AEA demonstration workshop offered later by the Kellogg team.}

Cultivating Holistic, Culturally-grounded Evaluation Approaches, Cornel Pewewardy, University of Kansas and Kalyani Rai, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

Spotlight the need for culturally contextualizing program logic models as well as other evaluation tools and techniques. As a concrete example of a holistic, culturally-grounded approach, share the assessment/evaluation-related wisdom of the "Medicine Wheel." In general, lack of attentiveness to such issues often results in "tail-wagging-the-dog" evaluation initiatives--and, thus, in doing a disservice to the cultural context and the community being served.

Honoring and Engaging Many Voices: Facilitating Participation, Collaboration and Empowerment, Vanessa McKendall, FaceValu Consulting and Cindy Crusto, Yale University

Highlight the importance of diverse perspectives on and strategies for engaging various stakeholders in the program evaluation process: ranging from general participation to collaborative involvement and partnership to capacity-building organizational development and self-determination (empowerment evaluation).

Keeping Our Eyes on the Prize and Remaining Light on Our Feet: Diverse Roles of Evaluators, Hazel Symonette

Overview various roles of evaluators--e.g., judge, auditor, teacher, coach, mentor, facilitator: ways that we can be of service to and within communities of color, as well as other underrepresented and underserved communities. Explore with the Symposium community the conditions under which each role might be most useful vs problematic.

SESSSION 114: Panel

Room: Waiialua

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Pre-K-12 Educational Evaluation

Evaluation of Systemic Reform Efforts through the Eyes of Key Stakeholders

Chair: Kathy A Zantal-Wiener, Montgomery County Public Schools

Key stakeholders in a five-year initiative to implement systemic reform in middle school science ù evaluators, program director, and a classroom teacher ù will discuss issues in evaluating systematic reform in a large school district. Each stakeholder group will address how the evaluation activities contributed to enhancing their respective roles. For example, evaluators will discuss ongoing efforts to maintain the 'big picture' while increasing expectations for teachers because of a spiraling training initiative. The program director will describe how the evaluation supported and interfaced with the training activities. Lastly, a key stakeholder, a classroom teacher will recount how both the evaluation and the professional development activities changed classroom instruction and her role as a science teacher leader. There will be ample time for audience discussion and panel reflection. The issues raised by the evaluators regarding refinement of evaluation expectations over time, as well as the cross-discussion of evaluation findings from the evaluators' and teachers' perspectives will lead to fruitful dialogue.

Presenters: *Keeping An Eye on the Big Picture*, Kathy A Zantal-Wiener, Montgomery County Public Schools

Members of the evaluation team will discuss how they maintained their focus on the original evaluation goals throughout the first three years of the systemic reform initiative while continuing to modify the lenses used to examine teacher growth and systemic reform of science education. For example, evaluators participate in all training activities to understand the sequence and type of knowledge and strategies acquired by the teachers. In doing so, the evaluators changed their expectations for the teachers. The discussion will focus on the implications of the changing expectations and how they served to refine the data collection and analysis activities, especially the classroom observation process to match the changing expectations.

The Evaluators as Critical Friends, Patricia Hagan, Montgomery County Public Schools

The project director will articulate how the evaluators are 'critical friends,' to the project. Discussion topics will include: how the evaluation supports the reform efforts, interactions between project staff and the evaluation team, and how evaluation data helped to refine and redirect the initiative. The project director also will report how the evaluators' substantive expertise, perceived neutrality, perceived independence, insightfulness, interpersonal skills, engagement, communication skills, and adherence to evaluation standards contributed to the usefulness of the evaluation data.

Responding to Classroom Challenges Using Evaluation Data, Vivian Wayne, Montgomery County Public Schools

As an active participant in both the training and the evaluation the teacher will describe how both activities responded to the challenges faced in the classroom. The teacher will reflect on the changes she has made to her own teaching practice, and provide illustrations of the changes in her practice that are supported by general evaluation findings.

Discussant: Susan Gross, Montgomery County Public Schools

SESSION 115: Roundtables

Room: Waianae

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Groups on Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health and Health Evaluation

Examining Treatment and Prevention Programs

(This session includes two 45-minute rotations of roundtables. The Host will ask the tables to rotate at 5:15.)

Host: Robert G Orwin, Battelle Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation

Roundtable A (First Rotation): Evaluating Community Health Promotion Initiatives

Presenters: *Evaluating Community Health Promotion Partnerships: Experiences from the California Wellness Foundation's Health Improvement Initiative*, Dave Pearson & Sandra Senter, Group Health Community Foundation

Traditional methods for evaluating community-based health promotion efforts are often not feasible. This presentation describes an alternative approach now being applied to 9 community-level partnerships in California. This work is driven by a case study, logic model approach and the concept of "empowerment evaluation," which emphasizes partnerships between communities and researchers, intermediate outcomes, process assessment, and building the community's own evaluation capacity. Research procedures include interviews, site visits, and gathering of documents to assess the ability of local health partnerships to achieve intermediate outcomes. Mid-initiative evaluation results suggest progress in building the capacity of local partnerships and local evaluators. Lessons learned for the Initiative-level and local level evaluations will be shared including those that relate to approaches, processes, indicators, reporting and dissemination.

Empowering Minority Women Through a Culturally Sensitive Health Promotion Program, Monica Schaffner, Bowling Green State University

Multiple community groups cooperate at multiple sites within a large Midwestern city in a state and local government run minority women's health promotion and disease prevention program, for which the focus is on exercise nutrition and developing a healthy lifestyle. The overall goal of the project is to empower African American women with knowledge about health issues specific to their population, and prevention strategies and skills to improve their health and the health of their communities. The evaluation makes use of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods to follow the path of the program logic model through its ultimate outcomes, which include an increase in community consciousness about health, and women who have been empowered to continue the program long after the funding has expired. Data collected thus far affirm a positive impact on the community; families of the participating women, and of course the women themselves.

Roundtable B (First Rotation): Implications of Considering Culture in Evaluating Health Programs

Presenters: *The Intersection of Culture, Health and Systems Change: Evaluation Findings From Two California Community Building Initiatives*, Zoe Cardoza Clayson, San Francisco State University

Over the past decade, creating community wide initiatives has become a strategy for strengthening the health and well-being of low income communities. In part, these efforts have been fueled by the works of John McKnight who developed the theoretical underpinnings for an assets-based approach to assessing communities. This paper presents the results of two evaluations of initiatives located in California's, multi-ethnic, low-income communities, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation's Communities 2000 Initiative and the San Francisco Foundation's Lifeline Initiative. Based upon a grounded theory approach, the findings include an analysis of the power of context (social, economic, and political forces), the limits of structures (institutional and system-wide), and the challenges of diversity within the initiatives. Through the use of case studies, the evaluations demonstrate the intersection between culture, health and system-wide issues.

Clinical and Political Implications in Evaluating a Bicultural Program, Gerald A Bunn, Evaluations and Auditing Services Ltd

It is necessary, when evaluating Alcohol & Drug programmes with a cultural component, to pay attention to political as well as clinical issues. Although many ethnic groups now live in New Zealand, the main cultural division is still identified as Maori (New Zealand's 'tangata whenua', or 'people of the land) and Pakeha (non-Maori). The status of Maori is defined in the Treaty of Waitangi, considered the nation's founding document. The Treaty is a unique political instrument which aims to protect and enhance 'rangatiratanga' (sovereignty), which is the right of Maori to live and develop in a Maori way. This has been interpreted as meaning that Maori should have control over their own health services. Generally, New Zealand's mental health services are delivered as either Maori-only or mainstream programmes. This paper will describe a unique bicultural A&D treatment, and subsequent evaluation effort, that exists at Queen Mary Hospital, Hanmer Springs, New Zealand. The hospital operates on principles described as Parallel

Programming whereby Maori are treated in their own cultural setting, the Taha Maori programme. Pakeha, or non-Maori, are treated using a mainstream approach. While separate in some functions, all patients interact with each other at various points of the day's activities, including some clinical events. These programmes were separately evaluated, as it was recognised that 'instruments developed along Eurocentric approaches cannot be blindly applied to people of colour.' (Suzuki, et al, 1996) However, the absence of specific instruments and procedures for Maori required adaptation of Western tools and procedures. To accomplish this, extensive and time consuming consultation was required with a variety of stakeholders. A summary of findings will be presented along with observations on how political and clinical issues interacted, either supporting or impeding clinical safety. A five-year period is covered (1995 - 1999).

Roundtable C (First Rotation): Innovative Approaches to Measuring the Effects of Treatment Interventions

Presenters: *Client-staff Collaborative Evaluation of Domestic Violence Services*, Karen Beck Wade, WestEd

This presentation describes the development, pilot testing, and early implementation of an innovative approach to the evaluation of a multiple-component domestic violence prevention and treatment program. Due to the inherent difficulties in documenting changes on standardized mental health measures and other psychological constructs, a self-assessment instrument for battered women was designed to incorporate several outcome domains rooted in program goals and content: safety/violence free living, economic self-sufficiency, self-concept/empowerment, social support and communication skills, parenting skills, and child behavior and affect. A corollary instrument was developed for batterers to measure progress on similar domains. Clients assess their progress on several indicators within each domain. Validity of client self-assessment is enhanced by staff review of client responses, and as, needed, negotiation of final answers. Thus the evaluation instrument/process has become a therapeutic tool. Modifications of the approach for shelter and transitional housing residents vs. non-resident counseling clients will be discussed.

Increasing Evaluation Capacity: Creating Dynamic Partnership between Program and Evaluation, Cara C Ernst, University of Washington

P-CAP, a paraprofessional advocacy program working with substance-abusing mothers in Washington state, began as a CSAP demonstration project. Nine years later, the program, and its integral program evaluation component, is State-funded and operating at multiple sites state-wide. This award-winning model, including the evaluation component, is being replicated in Manitoba, Alberta, Minnesota and Ohio. Evaluation measures demographics, client time with advocate, ongoing client progress, and uses a pre and post-test measure (our modification of the Addiction Severity Index). Reports are generated on a regular basis. Findings are useful to substance-abuse policy makers as well as to program staff. Through evaluation strategies and carefully designed methodologies and mentalities embedded in the program, missing data rates are low, accuracy of data is high, and staff, who collect a lot of data, do not see it as an undue burden. Strategies and methodologies used to accomplish this will be discussed.

Roundtable D (First Rotation): Evaluating Prevention Programs for Middle School Students

Presenters: *How Did You Do That? The Formative Evaluation of a Multi-site Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Initiative*, Rhonda A Bohs, Lauren Strano, & Sonia Rivas, DLR Consultants Inc

The prevention of teenage pregnancy has been in the national spotlight for several years, resulting in many pregnancy prevention initiatives. Five pregnancy prevention programs targeting middle school students began implementation in 1999. This roundtable discussion will report lessons learned during the first year of these multi-component youth development model programs. The mixed-method process evaluation of implementation included data related to staff characteristics and turnover, successful and unsuccessful youth recruitment methods, and focus groups with staff and youth.

A Longitudinal Evaluation of Botvin's Life Skills Training Drug Prevention Program: Findings and Challenges in School-based Evaluation, Robert G LaChausse, California State University at San Bernardino and Joann Hoffman, Hoffman, Clark and Associates

Life Skills Training (LST) is a three-year drug prevention program that targets middle school students. The LST

curriculum offers a cognitive and behavioral skills-based approach to drug prevention for adolescents. Past studies regarding the efficacy of the LST approach have been criticized due to an inability to replicate effects in a diverse student population and lack of staff buy-in to key curriculum and evaluation components. The current evaluative study examines the efficacy of LST on a highly diverse population of students in a large urban California school district. The study incorporated both formative and summative evaluation including an examination of the effects of LST on risk and resiliency factors, drug resistance skills, and drug behaviors. Factors related to program replication including teacher fidelity to curriculum components and challenges in evaluation design, utilization and staff capacity building will be discussed.

Roundtable A (Second Rotation): Challenges to Evaluating Health Programs in Work Settings

Presenters: *Validation of an Evaluation Instrument for Healthy Work Organization*, Mark G Wilson, David M DeJoy, Robert J Vandenberg, Brenda L Greene & Allison McGrath, University of Georgia

The primary purpose of this presentation is to delineate and discuss the validation of a healthy work organization questionnaire and discuss its applications for evaluating organizations and interventions. The instrument is based on a theoretical model that emphasizes organizational factors, job design, workplace climate, job future, and employee perceptions and expectations which are predicted to impact organizational outcomes (financial as well as employee health and well-being). The key function is the development of an instrument that serves as a valid and reliable measure of the constructs of the model. Results from three phases of the validation process conducted with a large retail organization will be shared: content validation, exploratory factor analyses, and confirmatory factor analyses. The presentation will examine how the model and instrument can be used to profile an organization and evaluate specific initiatives undertaken within organizations.

Evaluating Workplace Programs, Valerie S Nelkin, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

This paper is based on a Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) funded evaluation of health prevention programs at a variety of worksites, including university-based prevention programs and major corporations. It discusses a number of key issues in evaluating workplace programs, such as corporate cultures and data access (e.g., negotiating with unions for access to employee health records); confidentiality concerns; corporate data quality and availability (e.g., are historical records typically kept and automated?); selling evaluation in a corporate context; and evaluation issues of primary concern from a corporate viewpoint. This paper presents a variety of innovative approaches and techniques that can be applied in evaluation practice, especially assessment of programs in a work or industrial setting.

Roundtable B (Second Rotation): Beyond Pre- and Post-testing

Presenters: *When Pre-post Testing Fails: An Alternative for Measuring Outcomes in a Substance Abuse Prevention Program for Children*, Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates

Outcome measurement commonly involves pre-post testing of participants and a comparison group on changes expected to occur from program participation. This paper will describe an evaluation in which pre-post tests were inadequate for measuring outcomes in an in-school substance abuse prevention program for children, aged five through 12. The intended program outcomes were: improved knowledge about drug use, more open communication about drugs in the home, enhanced self-competence, and increased feelings of the importance of bonding with peers and adults. When literature and Internet searches did not uncover measures suitable to measure these outcomes in children under 12 years an alternative method was designed based primarily upon qualitative data. This paper will describe an attempt to quantify qualitative data from children about these outcomes. The audience will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of this approach and other alternatives to outcome measurement with young children.

Increasing Evaluation Capacity: Evaluating Subtle Degrees of Change in a Complex Environment, Cara C Ernst, University of Washington

The Seattle Model of Paraprofessional Advocacy proposed a three-year one-to-one relationship-based intervention with long-time substance-abusing mothers. Evaluating the effectiveness of this holistic intervention, proposed to

impact many different areas of a woman's life within a milieu of competing influences, in turn required a holistic approach to analysis. While pre- post-test change was striking on every domain, differences between the participant and comparison group were less so. Quasi-experimental evaluation research is often a process of building an argument of effectiveness (or noneffectiveness) from many smaller pieces. Presented will be a paper on the evaluation of this program detailing a composite variable approach useful in revealing small incremental changes in participants, combined with a level-of-involvement vs outcome analysis that reinforced the finding of effective.

Roundtable C (Second Rotation): Examining Stakeholder Involvement in HIV Prevention and Risk-reduction Initiatives

Presenters: *Evaluating HIV Sexual Risk-reduction Interventions: Assessing Empowerment Capacity*, Jimmy L Boyd, Research Services Unlimited Inc

In the assessment of intervention effectiveness, theoretically-based interventions offer the most promising results in terms of risk-behavioral modification. This study sought to evaluate the efficacy of Community-based Organizations (CBOs) prevention intervention among African American females at risk for acquiring HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. Utilizing the Empowerment theory, critical assessments were analyzed in an effort to produce favorable outcome measures such as increased HIV risk-reduction knowledge, enhanced assertiveness techniques relating to sexual encounters, improved sexual communication, and verified proper condom-use skills. The intervention focused on skills training and strategies necessary to modify risk-taking behaviors. 150 conveniently sampled participants were used in the study with age ranges from 18-47 and a host of other selected demographics. The participants were recruited through Street outreach and Peer Education training. Results indicated an enhanced overall increased in the outcome measures. Conclusions were drawn on the fact that community based HIV risk-reduction programs that are gender relevant and culturally sensitive are necessary in providing needed psychosocial skills when assessing the efficacy of interventions.

Evaluating the HIV Prevention Community Planning Process at the Local & National Level, Romel S Lacson & Huey T Chen, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and David Cotton, Macro International

HIV prevention community planning (CP) was designed to serve as the building block for all HIV prevention efforts within jurisdictions and across the country. When CP is implemented as intended, it produces a sound, need-based, comprehensive HIV prevention plan that should guide health departments in the allocation of funds for HIV prevention interventions in their jurisdictions. At the national level, many good studies of the implementation of CP have been conducted. While the studies contribute vital information, the majority are primarily descriptive and qualitative, are based on a limited sample of grantees, and has used varied data collection methods. CDC is working with their national partners to develop an evaluation study of CP that will address both the implementation of community planning and the outcomes that will be hypothesized to be associated with CP. The purposes of the session are to 1) provide a general framework driven by evaluation questions for use by stakeholders, 2) discuss the nature of CP and reasons for evaluating the initiative and methods for data collection, 3) describe systematic collection and analysis of CP evaluation data and how it can be used, 4) describe the capacity building resources around community planning evaluation.

SESSION 116: Panel and Roundtables

Room: Molokai

Federal, State and Local Level Evaluation of Safe Schools Initiatives

(This session will begin with a 45-minute mini-panel followed by roundtable breakouts)

Chair: Robert L Flewelling, Research Triangle Institute

PANEL: Evaluating the Federal Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative: An Overview and Discussion of Key Considerations

Panelists: *Process Evaluation Design and Activities for the National Evaluation*, Phillip W Graham, Research Triangle Institute

The purpose of the process evaluation is to document how, by whom, and in what context, key aspects of programmatic components and relevant school policies are actually implemented, as well as broader contextual

factors that enhanced or impeded the program's implementation. More specifically, the process evaluation design for the SS/HS employs a two-prong approach to more fully describe and understand the complexities that accompany the planning, designing, and implementation of comprehensive prevention strategies within the school context. The first approach examines relevant process-related activities across all 54 SS/HS sites, while the second approach augments the first through the collection of more in-depth information from a subset of SS/HS sites (i.e., sentinel sites). Specific data collection activities will include web-based surveys and telephone interviews across all SS/HS sites and focus groups, semi-structured face-to-face interviews, and record abstraction at the sentinel sites.

Outcome Evaluation Design and Activities for the National Evaluation, Robert L Flewelling, Research Triangle Institute

The objective of the outcome evaluation is to compare changes in outcome measures in the funded sites (collectively) to changes observed in either national samples or matched comparison sites, depending on the data source. Outcome measures that have no suitable sources of comparison data will be assessed for changes over time only. The design will also allow for comparisons across various subgroups of similar sites. Baseline data will be collected in the fall of 2000. Comparison data will be obtained from a variety of sources, which will include national surveys that have used the same or similar instruments as used for the SS/HS sites. Standardized data collection protocols and measures will be used across all the sites, and will involve a mixture of data collection strategies, including student surveys for older students, teacher rating forms for younger students, surveys of parents and school personnel, and archival data.

Evaluation Design and Activities at the Local Level, Charles Giuli, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

The Central Oahu District of the Hawaii State Department of Education is one of the initial 54 sites to be awarded a Safe Schools/Health Students grant. This primarily suburban LEA includes 34,500 students in 41 schools on the Island of Oahu. The planned intervention entails the implementation of an integrated and comprehensive service delivery model in concert with greater and more meaningful participation of parents. The local evaluation of this intervention will be conducted by Hawaii-based Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL). By design, the role and activities of the local evaluator will be largely independent of the national cross-site evaluation effort, and will be structured to provide timely, formative information to the site director regarding the implementation of the intervention. Issues and outcomes that are unique or of particular relevance to this site will also be addressed in the local evaluation design.

Discussant: Michael W Arthur, University of Washington

ROUNDTABLE A: Tapping into Stakeholder Knowledge and Expertise for School Violence Reduction

Presenters: *An Approach to Cost-effective Self-evaluation Capacity Building*, Joy M Evans & Rebecca L Koladycz, Metis Associates Inc

This paper explores a methodological approach to using limited evaluation resources to simultaneously assess implementation, measure impact, and build self-evaluation capacity in a districtwide K-12 violence prevention program. While conducting a traditional qualitative and quantitative evaluation, the evaluator engaged local staff in a series of self-evaluation capacity-building activities. The primary strategy for building local capacity was to assist staff in identifying internal data sources already accessible to them. Additionally, the evaluators worked with project staff to jointly identify evaluation questions, develop analysis specifications, and synthesize, analyze and interpret results. By project's end, local stakeholders were capable of conducting many of their own analyses of indicator variables on an ongoing basis. This study has implications for evaluation practice in that it offers a practical approach to providing project staff with useful evaluation data while simultaneously building their capacity to self-evaluate.

Adolescents' Perceptions of School Safety and Their Solutions for Reducing School Violence: A Rural High School Case Study, Ellen J deLara, Cornell University

Although adolescents are the primary targets of violence in schools, their opinions about this national problem are rarely elicited. This exploratory case study investigates the perceptions of students from a mixed methods approach.

By chance, the research has captured pre and post Littleton, Colorado data. Using action research, the study brings forward themes relevant to adolescents about the safety of their work environment, the school. It further provides a voice for empowerment of the primary stakeholders, the students in their primary social setting and for local policy change where needed.

ROUNDTABLE B: Examining the Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities Act at Various Levels

Presenters: *Local Evaluation of the Safe and Drug-free Schools and Communities Act Program: Should We Build Capacity or Redefine Expectations?* Scott Crosse & Irene Hantman, Westat

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Program (SDFSCA) is the largest federal school-based substance abuse and violence prevention program in the United States. The U.S. Department of Education sponsored the Study of Local Education Agency Activities under the SDFSCA to examine local program planning, implementation, and evaluation. The study method entailed a national probability sample survey of approximately 600 school districts and a review of written materials from a subsample of districts. We will present findings on how districts collect and use prevention-related needs assessment and evaluation data. We also will discuss these findings in the light of recent program reforms and the amount of SDFSCA and other resources available to districts for prevention. Given current resources, observed deficiencies in some aspects of local evaluation raise questions about the extent to which we should be building evaluation capacity or redefining federal expectations for what can reasonably be accomplished.

A Successful Model for Statewide Capacity-building: The Virginia Effective Practices Project, Anne J Atkinson, PolicyWorks Ltd; and Jeanne Martino-McAllister, James Madison University

Local coordinators of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) programs in Virginia have made evaluation an integral part of their program planning and implementation process as the result of the Virginia Effective Practices Project. A national model for local capacity-building, the Project is designed to assist programs to operate in accordance with recently enacted SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness. A cadre of evaluation specialists with strong backgrounds in prevention provide training and follow-up technical assistance which have increased evaluation capacity and use in over 90 school divisions. Preliminary evaluation of the Project has shown a) increased use of data for program planning and b) greater use of measurable, results-oriented goals and objectives (from 12.5% in 1997 to 86.9% in 1999). The paper will describe the Project model, its operation, and its results. Project products including the Evaluation Training Curriculum and an accompanying Evaluation Handbook will be available for review.

ROUNDTABLE C: Evaluating the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative at the Local Level

Presenters: *Targeted Evaluation of a School-based Anger Management Curriculum*, Kathleen H Armstrong, Oliver T Massey, & Marcela Gutierrez-Mayka, University of South Florida

Our nation is facing an explosion of school violence with increased incidents of aggressive/assaultive behaviors. Aggressive students represent a growing challenge for communities attempting to provide a safe learning environment for children. As part of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative awarded to Pinellas County Schools, Florida (1999), the THINK FIRST Anger Management Program was initiated in 4 high schools to teach disruptive students alternatives to aggression. Required by the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative is an evaluation component, intended to document the effectiveness of programs provided with grant funding. The programs' evaluation standards include: (1)an experimental design, (2)evidence of statistically significant deterrent effect, (3)replication at multiple sites, and (4)evidence that effects are sustained for at least one year. With the Pinellas Anger Management Team, FMHI/USF Evaluation Team developed a logic model to document the effectiveness of THINK FIRST. This paper discusses outcome evaluation activities Year 1.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative: Evaluating a Comprehensive Federal Program in the San Francisco Unified School District, Pamela M Jakwerth & BA Laris, Education, Training, and Research Associates

The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) was awarded funding to implement the Federal Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative for which the local evaluator is ETR Associates. Through the Initiative, SFUSD is

establishing comprehensive plans to address the following: violence prevention and school safety, alcohol and drug use prevention, school and community mental health, early childhood development, and school reform. The Initiative is working specifically with seven high schools and ten elementary schools in an ethnically diverse, urban district. School violence prevention and health promotion programs have become national priorities. It is critical to systematically evaluate these programs and define effective practices. ETR is using an evaluation based on a context, input, process, product model. We focus on outcomes for students, schools, the district, families, and community agencies and the factors that lead to these outcomes. Data will come from a combination of quantitative and qualitative sources, including surveys, focus groups, records, meeting notes, observations, and case studies.

ROUNDTABLE D: Issues in Evaluating Multi-program Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiatives

Presenters: *Design Implications of Multi-program Evaluations in the Safe Schools Initiative*, Oliver T Massey, Kathleen H Armstrong, & Marcela Gutierrez-Mayka, University of South Florida

The Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative is a jointly funded federal effort to reduce violence and drug abuse and promote healthy child development in over 50 LEA's around the nation. The Pinellas County School System in Florida is one of the urban recipients of this three year grant. Their proposal incorporated fourteen distinct programs to fulfill the aims of the initiative (e.g., social marketing, alternatives to out of school suspension, social skills training, anger management curricula, K-9 drug units, and therapeutic partnership programs). This paper discusses responses to the challenges of evaluating this heterogeneous group of programs. Presenters will outline design and methodological approaches developed to maximize evaluation results including: clustering programs with similar strategies and outcomes, systematizing the use of pertinent tools, using existing school system and program data, and developing new measures applicable across programs. Design implications of multi-program evaluations will be examined.

Management Evaluation Solutions in Multiple-program Evaluations, Marcela Gutierrez-Mayka, Oliver T Massey & Kathleen H Armstrong, University of South Florida

The Pinellas County School system is one of the urban recipients of the Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiatives. The proposal includes fourteen distinct programs separately operated by the Board of Education, the County Health Department, the County Sheriff's Office, and four different community service and mental health agencies. This presentation focuses on the formative role played by evaluators in promoting the integration of the diverse programs funded by the grant to support the achievement of common outcomes. Presenters will describe the formative, management oriented strategies used to facilitate grant activities that include: integration of the evaluation in the grant management plan, provision of guidance to project partners in the evaluation process; linkage of evaluation with the grant's steering committee; capitalizing on existing research opportunities within the system; establishing the buy-in of community partners in their evaluation responsibilities, and skill building and technical assistance in evaluation methodologies.

ROUNDTABLE E: Evaluation Criteria for the Safe Disciplined Drug-Free Schools' Expert Review Panel's Exemplary and Promising Prevention Program Initiative

Presenters: Joanne Farley, Farley & Associates
David B Wilson, University of Maryland

The conversation will focus on issues and questions of import to evaluators which are raised by the evaluation criteria specified by the Safe Disciplined Drug-Free Schools' Expert Review Panel in recognizing exemplary and promising programs. Most importantly, parties to the conversation will discuss what implications these criteria have for the design and practical conduct of evaluations in school and community settings and across diverse target groups. Issues of the ways in which these criteria may limit or enhance equitable consideration of programs will also be explored.

ROUNDTABLE F: Building Capacity in a Very Large System: Evaluating Los Angeles Unified School District's Health, Safety, and Prevention Programs

The evaluation of very large, complex systems poses unique issues regarding capacity building. WestEd's evaluation

research program area is evaluating the Health, Safety, and Drug, Alcohol, and Tobacco Education programs of the Los Angeles Unified School District. As the second largest school district in the country, with almost 800,000 students in over 650 schools, the evaluation lessons learned are deep and relevant to many evaluations, regardless of size. This panel will present solutions to key capacity building issues including: (a) guiding program planning, development, and implementation with evaluation findings; (b) using evaluation data in support of proposal writing and fundraising; and (c) planning large professional development and skill-building programs based on evaluation findings.

Presenters: *Evaluation Data and Program Planning*, Toia Thompson, WestEd

Ms. Toia Thompson, who is coordinating the evaluation of the Los Angeles Unified School District's Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities funded programs, will present innovative ways in which evaluation data are used for planning, developing, and implementing programs. Issues to be addressed include: (a) developing data collection systems in support of program planning; (b) identifying salient data; (c) providing data to program staff in a useful and useable way; and (d) assisting program staff in making program choices based on evaluation findings.

Using Evaluation Data to Support Proposal Writing and Fundraising, Heredia Alberto, WestEd

Mr. Alberto Heredia, who is coordinating the evaluation of the Los Angeles Unified School District's Tobacco Use Prevention Education funds, will present ways in which evaluation findings are used in support of proposal writing and fundraising. In addition, Mr. Heredia will discuss: (a) ensuring evaluation data being collected support reporting requirements; (b) working with multiple groups within a system to develop comprehensive proposals; and (c) institutionalizing data collection and reporting efforts.

Evaluation in Support of Professional Development, Jeannie Huh-Kim, WestEd

Dr. Jeannie Huh-Kim, who is coordinating the evaluation of the Los Angeles Unified School District's HIV/AIDS Prevention Programs, will discuss how evaluation data are used to guide and support professional development for teachers, health educators, and program staff. She will address: (a) needs assessments as professional development planning data; (b) using program evaluation process data to inform professional development; and (c) using evaluation data to ensure curriculum choices and modifications meet professional's needs.

Discussant: Jordan E Horowitz, WestEd

SESSION 117: Skill-building Workshop

Room: Kauai

Ethical Dilemmas in Evaluation Practice: Practical Application of Decision-making Strategies

Chair: Patricia A Lawler, Widener University

Presenters: John H Fielder, Villanova University

Patricia A Lawler, Widener University

Mildred A Savidge, University of Arkansas

Stephen C Wilhite, Widener University

The explanatory notes for the AEA Guiding Principles acknowledge that the principles may be in conflict in particular situations. Evaluators must then "use their own values and knowledge of the setting to determine the appropriate response" (Assumption E). While this is certainly true, it does not provide much guidance on how to do this in a professional way or help for those of us working in isolated settings. Fortunately there are ethical decision making models which can provide a professional approach to ethical problems. Drawing from each of our experiences in ethics, evaluation, adult learning and administration of professional programs where ethical guidelines are a major concern in research and practice, we will present a useful model from the literature and illustrate its use. Several case studies posing evaluation dilemmas will be presented. Participants in small groups will apply the model and discuss the ethical implications of the case. The last part of the session will be devoted to ethical problems in evaluation provided by participants in a protected forum for discussion and collegial feedback.