

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P1 Service Orientation:</b> Evaluations should be designed to assist organizations to address and effectively serve the needs of the full range of targeted populations.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Potentially very relevant since it relates to an organization's service to consumers.	Use of "full range" of targeted participants suggests equity, inclusiveness, and access.	As written the standard appears only to address intended and direct consumers.	Make language more encompassing by removing "targeted" so that the reference is to all participants.
<i>Overview</i>	This is an opportunity to raise understanding of the sometimes differing perspectives of those involved in evaluation, building on the issues of cultural competency as a necessary part of a service orientation.	Overview broadens the focus of the standard to include community and society emphasizing social change consequences, and moves evaluation beyond exclusively managerial concerns	It is tersely worded and could be expanded to provide more information. It is currently shorter than many of the overviews undermining perceptions of the importance of this standard.	Could be expanded to discuss direct and indirect consumers, the differing perspectives of managers, providers and consumers, and the conceptualization of public good in more detail. This would provide an opportunity to show how serving community and society incorporates effectively serving those from different groups.
<i>Guidelines</i>	These guidelines are particularly relevant to our work because they provide an opportunity to operationalize a social change agenda		The guidelines do not all seem to fit this standard. Additionally the present wording seems to limit the scope of the standard rather than make it specific.	Review all eight guidelines and consider reordering them with E first, and others modified or left out completely. Rewrite of guidelines should infuse more depth and enthusiasm, less impeachment and limitation of the standard.
<i>Common Errors</i>	This is an extremely important standard, and the Joint Committee should strengthen the language upholding it.		The list is superficial and contradictory, with some entries that undermine the integrity of the Standard. <b>"H" is particularly problematic and may create a bias against many standpoint methodologies.</b>	This should be re-written. It is weakly supported, and superficial. It fails to capture the complexity of the issues surrounding the role of the evaluation is supporting the public good.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Because the case begins with an indication that this is an urban district, it sets up an expectation that culture could be important but then ignores this variable suggesting that it is not important even in an urban setting.	The case appropriately highlights the problem of inconsistent scope between evaluation and the decision to be made.	The boundaries of the evaluand are fuzzy and appear inconsistent in the case rendering it not useful for this standard.	This case should be replaced with two cases that show contrasting views of evaluation serving the community and public through improving a program and alternatively through a situation where program survival was not likely to meet needs.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P2 Formal Agreements:</b> Obligations of the formal parties to an evaluation (what is to be done, how, by whom, when) should be agreed to in writing, so that these parties are obligated to adhere to all conditions of the agreement or formally to renegotiate it.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This standard is culturally bound and while it reflects many bureaucratic perspectives it may not fit emergent models as well.	The intent to establish agreement is sound.	Standard is not congruent with all evaluation contexts, or models	The standard should be more generic in describing the important agreements which should be in place without specifying that they must all occur at a specific time or in a specific format.
<i>Overview</i>	Cultural differences in modes of negotiation and/or documentation of agreement could be acknowledged in the overview setting up greater understanding of its impact.	The goal of mutual understanding is clear and the options of a formal contract versus a memo of understanding is good	Overview does not address the appropriate course of action when mutual respect and confidence are not present, it also fails to introduce issues of prejudice and power differential that may enter the contracting process	The overview should be rewritten to avoid the presumption of a preordained evaluation design (in which “the total evaluation plan” is known in advance) and a written final report (to which the contract can be appended, p. 88). The revision could allow for discussion of alternative ways to meet the goal of the standard without forcing a contractual model where it may not fit.
<i>Guidelines</i>	Guidelines are most clearly linked to potential cultural issues and current expression presents subtle and overt messages pushing a limiting perspective.	Provides some pertinent information for situations where a formal agreement and contract are desirable.	Currently does not reflect consideration of cultural issues, and privileges a managerial or top down perspective in negotiations and review.	Guidelines should be augmented with items appropriate to emergent designs and which recognize other forms of authority structures including tribal laws.
<i>Common Errors</i>	Common errors would provide an opportunity to discuss the problem of not honoring culturally based authority and negotiation processes.	(C) is important and congruent with inclusion of consumers in the evaluation process and (D) is excellent regarding voluntary participation and power assumptions		Revision would provide an opportunity to include matters supporting cultural competence as “important contractual matters.”
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	The case fails to identify elements which would demonstrate relevance of cultural issues.	Case supports the role of a formal agreement in assisting the evaluator in protecting their intellectual property investment	Since the evaluand itself involves evaluation procedures, this entire case is meta-evaluation	This case presents an example of an unscrupulous client and it may be naïve to assert that a contract would have altered their sense of what would violate the integrity of the report so the case should be altered or not used.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	This case is illustrative of important points but not directly tied to cultural competence.	Provides a clear scenario of importance generally.		This case and analysis could be maintained as written.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P3 Rights of Human Subjects:</b> Evaluations should be designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This standard is a very important one relative to cultural competency by setting up implications for protection of participants.		The phrase “human subjects” comes packaged with a lot of assumptions regarding epistemology, position of the researcher and researched	Should be flagged for rewording with a substitution for the term human subjects, perhaps a better phrase would be “participants in the evaluation process.”
<i>Overview</i>	The overview in its current version focuses on legal rights and protection, but the standard itself gives equal emphasis to <b>respect</b> . This is extremely important and often culturally defined.	It is appropriate to address power differentials among participants by drawing attention to the rights of persons who are recipients of goods or services since they may be more vulnerable to coercion or exploitation than stakeholders who may also be participants in the evaluation.	By not addressing the respect aspect of the standard the overview reduces the scope of the standard significantly.	A paragraph should be added to the overview to examine the importance of communicating respect to participants in the evaluation, both individually and collectively. Respect at the tribal, community, or group level should also be considered, as should respect along lines of cultural demarcation (e.g., Deaf Culture, religious affiliation, etc
<i>Guidelines</i>	There are many guidelines listed and they all have relevance to cultural competency since they relate to the manner in which participants are viewed and treated.		Numerous revisions and clarifications are needed to have these guidelines provide clear and specific illustration of the issues relevant to the standard	A guideline is needed that prompts the evaluator to examine his/her <i>own</i> values and cultural assumptions, noting similarities and differences between the evaluator and the participant positions
<i>Common Errors</i>		(B) Is very supportable and could even be broadened to speak of the general error of evaluators minimizing risk and offering false assurances of protection. (I) is also extremely important but poorly worded.	The overarching error here is failing to recognize context-relevant risks and potential violations and to guard against them in the selection of methods and procedures.	(A) would be strengthened by giving a definition of each term. Common errors could also address the situation where confidentiality or anonymity is promised but cannot be guaranteed. (G) should be expanded to include persons rendered vulnerable for other reasons covered by IRB guidelines.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	As written the case has potential significance however it is not fully developed either in the case presentation or highlighting problems and concerns.		Given the multiple possibilities of this case, the analysis seems a little thin.	The analysis fails to live up to the potential of the case. It should be further developed or eliminated. Providing an illustration with more serious flaws than those identified in the analysis or failing to identify the seriousness of these omissions serves to de-sensitize the reader to the problems involved.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	This case provides interesting issues but is not a priority case for cultural issues.			

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P4 Human Interactions:</b> Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with an evaluation, so that participants are not threatened or harmed.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This standard encapsulates many concerns regarding cultural competence, respecting human dignity and worth, but it extends beyond avoiding threat or harm.		Issues of power and privilege are at the heart of many evaluation interactions, it is problematic when evaluators do not recognize this dimension.	This standard is written at a micro level (personal interactions) but it also applies at a macro (community or society) level and could be modified to make that clearer.
<i>Overview</i>	Culture is never mentioned in the overview, but it is just behind the scenes throughout.	The overview correctly acknowledges that evaluations reflect positively or negatively on individuals or groups and their work.	While recognizing potential impact of evaluations, the overview , doesn't integrate this with guarding against potentially threatening or harmful effects.	<b>This entire standard feels underdeveloped, and could be a centerpiece of efforts to update the standards. There is much here to build upon and it seems to be a logical place for this to occur.</b>
<i>Guidelines</i>	These guidelines have clear relevance for cultural competence.		None of the Guidelines really tackle issues of respect for human worth and dignity or countervailing issues of prejudice, discrimination, and disrespect.	The language here should be more assertive and not suggest that these efforts are supplemental or less than critical to good evaluation.
<i>Common Errors</i>	Clearly relevant to cultural competence	(E) is extremely relevant. The variables listed, along with others we might add such as oral expression, are largely culturally defined.	These items are largely culturally defined and provide a stronger opportunity for inclusive language than the current writing reflects.	Standards of professionalism and confidentiality for evaluators are important and not particularly well developed. <b>This is a key area to which the AEA Ethics Committee should attend, as well as the recommended Joint Committee revision</b>
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	The case is one of few that directly addresses culturally related variables.		The evaluators operationally defined “poverty-level” but we are not told what their definition was, making it impossible to examine the values underlying that definition. The participants are largely defined by this single variable.	Interestingly, the violations in the scenario are so egregious and fundamental that it fits better under P3 Rights of Human Subjects than P4. Those involved lacked the cultural competence needed to carry out a valid evaluation in this context. The analysis does not take this position, however, and misses an important opportunity.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Neither gender nor economic status is mentioned in the scenario, but both are plausibly relevant to this cultural context	This analysis approaches issues of cultural context, respect, and power, and recognizes at least some of the issues of concern to our Committee, names them, and makes them visible.		The analysis points out that failure to include key stakeholders in planning communicates disrespect which can be read on both individual and organizational levels. With revision, this point should be highlighted.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P5 Complete and Fair Assessment:</b> The evaluation should be complete and fair in its examination and recording of strengths and weaknesses of the program being evaluated, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addresses.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This standard is potentially very rich and culturally relevant.		The text of this standard maintains a narrow interpretation, held over from the first edition.	This standard should be revised to realize its potential for dealing with important issues of validity, fairness and justice
<i>Overview</i>	By introducing the concept of fairness, this standard takes an important step toward examining equity issues in evaluation.	The balance issue raised in the first paragraph is important.	The second paragraph opens with a sentence that violates this standard!	This is an important standard hence the overview should be rewritten to address limitations noted.
<i>Guidelines</i>	<b>(B) is extremely important</b> as one of few references to diversity, even though the authors may not have been thinking about cultural diversity.		Given the central importance of issues of justice and fairness, the Guidelines for this standard seem underdeveloped and incompletely cross-referenced to other Standards.	The three Guidelines offered seem to marginalize this standard by operationalizing it in terms of reporting functions hence they should be rewritten to avoid this weakness.
<i>Common Errors</i>	(C) opens a window for cultural critique by alluding to the fact that strengths and weaknesses are socially constructed	Calling for consideration of “alternative perspectives ” is a strength.		When the standard was reworded and broadened for the second edition, the Guidelines and Common Errors (termed Pitfalls in the first edition) were not revised and broadened beyond reporting concerns.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	No cultural context information is provided, and this case does not illustrate concerns about fairness.			The case and analysis do not appear to be strong yet they are not as central to cultural competency concerns and could be ignored.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>				Given that neither case clearly addresses issues of fairness and potentially confuses this issue with completeness, it is recommended that at least one of these illustrations be replaced with one bringing focus to these issues.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P6 Disclosure of Findings:</b> The formal parties to an evaluation should ensure that the full set of evaluation findings along with pertinent limitations are made accessible to the person affected by the evaluation, and any others with expressed legal rights to receive the results.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This is small standard with large impact.	This standard supports inclusion of persons outside the authority structure.		This standard had a clearer advocacy position in the earlier version of the standards and might be revised in that spirit.
<i>Overview</i>	This standard takes a strong advocacy stance that is wholly congruent with the values of inclusion and supportive of multicultural validity.	This overview should be monitored during revision to insure that its intent is not diluted in future editions. The current form of this overview is worthy of praise for its strength.		It will be important for the Joint Committee and possibly our own <b>AEA Ethics Committee</b> to examine the implications of Ashcroft-era legislation and judicial interpretation on access to evaluative information.
<i>Guidelines</i>	(C) is very important to issues of diversity—e.g., the justification for inclusion of race as an explanatory variable or any similar procedures for including or excluding cultural dimensions should be fully justified.	(A) picks up the last point of the Overview and expands it. Certainly, this is an important dimension; disclosure parameters and procedures should be included in evaluation contracts or understandings.		It would be better to have a Guideline cautioning against thinking of disclosure only in terms of a final report (or maybe that's one for Common Errors). (I) will need to be revisited to address current legal and political climates affecting civil liberties and to bring in regulations regarding electronic communication, which appear nowhere in the current edition.
<i>Common Errors</i>	These are clearly relevant to cultural competence			Both the Guidelines and the Common Errors in this Standard seem to be spelled out in finer detail than for other Standards. The Joint Committee may wish to attend to level of detail in its editing, so that a comparable level is maintained across Standards.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	This is one of only a few cases with explicit cultural content.	The analysis points to the importance of insuring that formal agreements are in compliance with federal and state laws relating to disclosure of public information.		No clear revision is noted other than points for clarification and direct labeling of undercurrents such as racism.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	This illustration is relevant to culturally competence.	The analysis highlights compliance with standard P6: Stakeholders identified and consulted; questions framed around clearly-defined audience needs; results circulated to stakeholders; data released in a way to protect students	Procedures are appropriate, but nothing really zeros in on the complexities of disclosure, including opposing agendas or political positions, issues of harm in the use of information, a culture of litigation, or differing stakeholder perspectives.	It is useful to include positive as well as negative case illustrations, but it would be more useful to show how challenges were met rather than to present a case that appears to be without cultural competence challenges.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P7 Conflict of Interest:</b> Conflict of interest should be dealt with openly and honestly, so that it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	This is a basic ethics issue, but it could take on overtones of cultural identification.	It's good that both the evaluation process and results are noted as potentially subject to compromise.	None noted	None Noted
<i>Overview</i>	Personal interests may be ideological as well as financial.	The point is well made that potential conflicts of interest are essentially omnipresent in evaluation, and the key is learning how to deal with them.	The overview really zeros in on financial conflicts of interest without considering more subtle or complex issues of personal investment or benefit that may compromise an evaluation.	This Overview raises a number of important issues, improving in its breadth as it goes on. It readily lends itself to further expansion to deal more explicitly with cultural content, an area not visible in the current version.
<i>Guidelines</i>	This is a relevant set of guidelines.	<b>(F) is extremely important, as it explicitly broadens considerations beyond monetary gain to address culturally-defined advantages.</b>	(G) is troublesome, introducing potential managerial bias and implying that "agency heads" are somehow free of conflicts of interest.	It would be better if the Guideline direct attention to conflicts born of organizational position and authority rather than direct evaluators to work from only one perspective.
<i>Common Errors</i>	This list of common errors connects with concepts such as self reflection, making the list relevant.	(D) is an important caveat, and should additionally cite A5 Valid Information because this really raises a validity issue.		Exclusion is not necessarily the most appropriate way to address conflicts of interest, particularly if such exclusion compromises the validity of the study.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	No cultural context is given concerning either the district or these persons who developed the reading program.			DNA
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	No clear connection to cultural competence.			This is a comparatively lengthy scenario, raising a number of problems, only some of which concern Conflict of Interest. It would have more impact as an Illustrative Case if it were edited to focus on P7.

## Summary of Propriety Standards

<b>P8 Fiscal Responsibility:</b> The evaluator’s allocation and expenditure of resources should reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible, so that expenditures are accounted for and appropriate.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	With respect to our focus, it raises interesting issues of how culture may be viewed as a resource to be respected and “prudently and ethically expended” in evaluation.			What are the appropriate (sound) accountability procedures for overseeing the expenditure of cultural collateral?
<i>Overview</i>	The overview could be developed in a way which would increase relevance to cultural competence depending upon how resources are defined.	The caution against actual or alleged misuse of funds is certainly appropriate to overall ethical practice.	The overview narrows the focus of the standard to financial resources and the accounting, auditing and regulatory procedures governing fiscal transactions.	There are some fascinating possibilities here to explore issues of cultural collateral. It is recommended that the revision take on this challenge.
<i>Guidelines</i>	Has relevance for cultural competence		(D) may be appropriate as a general rule, but going with the lowest bid may not produce culturally competent evaluation.	(F) creates concerns because of the labor-intensive nature of inclusion and other procedures that support cultural competence, placing too high a value on frugality may lead to exclusion of these approaches.
<i>Common Errors</i>	Has relevance for cultural competence.		(H) is dishonest in representing the caliber of persons who will be completing the work.	In judging who is “qualified,” it is important to make sure relevant dimensions of cultural competence have been taken into account. The senior-level staff may be less qualified for work in certain contexts than more junior staff.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			There is only one case illustration for this standard. When adding a second case, it would be useful to take it beyond matters of financial budgeting.	(Seasoned evaluators should actually anticipate such action on the part of funder and design a contingency plan at the time of the original proposal development. This might be pointed out in a Guideline for this standard.)