

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

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

Guiding Principle	Alignment of Case Study to the Guiding Principles
<p>Systematic Inquiry <i>What evidence is there that the methods and approach used were indicative of systematic inquiry?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used an evaluation design that seemed acceptable to federal agency for funding (A1) • Used statistical procedures appropriate for a repeated measures design (A1) • Evaluation questions and approach were developed in an agency proposal; these were not negotiated between an external evaluator and client (A2) • Presentations at national conferences have provided some opportunity for scrutiny of the evaluation design and methods (A3)
<p>Competence <i>What competencies were necessary to conduct this evaluation?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator had extensive community-based evaluation experience (B1) • Research assistant had extensive program experience working with the homeless population (B2) • Research assistant lived in rural area; could be considered to be aware of rural values and issues (B2)
<p>Integrity/Honesty <i>How might the research assistant's advocacy raise concerns about the neutrality of the evaluation?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation team explained the evaluation plan and procedures to program staff, but not to other relevant stakeholders (C1) • Research assistant was explicit about his advocacy for the homeless, although his ability to maintain objectivity could be challenged (C2, C4) • Balance between the research assistant's personal experience and expertise and his objectivity have to be considered (C2, C4) • Evaluation team regularly conveyed preliminary data and findings to program staff and Advisory Council and facilitated their use for program improvement (C5)
<p>Respect for People <i>In what ways did the evaluators show respect for people in the case study, and what else might they have done?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research assistant was embedded in the program and the community so he knew the context very well (D1) • Evaluation team obtained IRB/human subjects approval (D2) • Clients were compensated for their participation in the evaluation (D2) • Use of verbatim responses to the open-ended questions in the first report may have violated client confidentiality if program staff could identify respondents (D2) • No clients were on the Advisory Council or were included among stakeholders who receive the evaluation reports (D5)
<p>Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare <i>How did the evaluators meet their responsibilities in dissemination of evaluation findings?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clients were included among stakeholders on the Advisory Council which received the evaluation reports (E1) • Evaluation team may not have been sufficiently careful in presenting the responses to the open-ended questions the first time if staff could determine the respondents' identities (E3) • Evaluation team regularly presented preliminary data reports in user-friendly formats and attempted to engage stakeholders in program improvement (E3) • Program staff felt ownership of the data and findings (E3) • Presentations at national meetings could contribute to the body of knowledge about homeless programs (E5)