

Summary of Utility Standards

U1 Stakeholder Identification: Persons involved in or affected by the evaluation should be identified, so that their need can be addressed.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	Using this standard w/in the context of cultural competence one should identify the dimensions of cultural diversity most relevant to this context.	This is an important standard, one that is highly relevant to culturally competent evaluation	Participant groups are not included as stakeholders. In the guidelines cases and case analyses, either they are ignored, presented as less important or given "token" attention.	It should be retained with more focus on participants as stakeholders.
<i>Overview</i>	The first sentence makes reference to diverse stakeholders, even though it does not explicitly refer to cultural diversity. All evaluations can be conceived of as culturally conceptualized and include consideration of cultural dimensions in the identification of stakeholders	The first paragraph focuses on the variety of roles that may come into play, which is fine.	The list of roles is top-heavy with management & administration. The second paragraph feels condescending, implying these groups have less power by definition, not by majority oppression.	This section could use more elaboration on the consumer side to add balance by also referencing consumers who are mandated into programs and those in need of /services. Overview-2 nd paragraph- could be strengthened. Rephrase the last sentence/first paragraph to avoid the unintended ranking of stakeholders. The dimensions of cultural diversity should be expanded to include economic status, ethnicity, education, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, gender, immigration, etc.
<i>Guidelines</i>	B-raises the important issue of how to identify representatives of stakeholder groups-- especially important when the evaluator may be an outsider to the group from which a representative is sought.	A-Could be strengthened by mentioning community leadership to clarify that more than authority figures within organizations should be identified. G- Good that this is explicitly stated.	D-should read "Reach an initial understanding with the client concerning the... otherwise E cannot really happen.	A-Perhaps altering the opening phrase to: Identify persons in formal and informal leadership roles" would help with this issue G-Expand the list of illustrative dimensions.
<i>Common Errors</i>			Evaluators sometimes settle too quickly for "representation" without considering who the representative is or what role that person is to play.	Descriptors under (F) could be expanded: tokenism might be an error worth adding to the list. Add error of "failing to anticipate competing or adversarial views of program goals and objectives held by stakeholders."
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	It is not clear how closely the Cases follow the facts of an actual event, but if reality-based, then the author would be able to judge the dimensions to include. There is no mention of cultural diversity, except age, implying that other characteristics are not relevant to consider.	The analysis, while not explicitly addressing cultural dimensions, does a nice job (paragraph one) challenging the authority-driven definition of stakeholders and emphasizing a more balanced perspective.	The mention of "early childhood interest groups" seemed dismissive of their input as an implied partisan perspective.	Here, for example, a sentence about the economic status of the community or of language diversity present would appear to be relevant to the story. We should be careful to infuse diversity in relevant ways, not as some politically correct litany of categories that could easily be dismissed.

Summary of Utility Standards

U1 Stakeholder Identification: Persons involved in or affected by the evaluation should be identified, so that their need can be addressed.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Neither case illustration tackles the tough issue of deciding who speaks for stakeholder groups outside of hierarchical organizations or systems.		The case has so many problems (inaccurate definition of goals, participants and success) that the Stakeholder Identification piece gets lost. It would seem to illustrate a Violation of Information Scope and Selection (U3) better than U1.	<p>If it were edited, relevant cultural factors should be introduced. For example, “factors that would influence placement rates” might include racism or sexism in the workplace.</p> <p>The problem with using cases in this format is that it suggests the only problem with the case is the one that is the focus of that standard.</p> <p>If the Joint Committee is open to replacing some of the case illustrations in the revision, I’d flag this one to be replaced.</p>

Summary of Utility Standards

U2 Evaluator Credibility: The persons conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation, so that the evaluation findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	Evaluators and stakeholders are the principal parties in evaluation, and thus both standards (UI and U2) are important and relevant to the conduct of evaluations that are culturally relevant.	The wording of this standard is appropriate and stresses that competence and trustworthiness of evaluators are important for findings to be utilized by stakeholders & primary intended users. This standard potentially unpacks prejudice surrounding “credibility.”	In many academic environments, “lack of credibility” is a thinly veiled euphemism for “not like me.” Evaluator competence includes knowledge and experience relevant to the activity’s cultural context and awareness of their own cultural position and identity.	Retain.
<i>Overview</i>		Major criteria for evaluator credibility are rightfully indicated in the opening paragraph. Also the importance of a team is stressed. A diverse and inclusive team should be desired.	The importance of participant views is overlooked.	Major revision required: to clarify the concept of credibility, (e.g., “other characteristics”, “test of credibility”, it is more than face validity, etc). It should speak to the importance of participant views and add dimensions of cultural context. The second paragraph should clearly state that credibility might be gained or lost at the outset <i>or at any time during the evaluation process.</i>
<i>Guidelines</i>	Other dimensions of diversity, i.e., education, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, health status, immigration status, could be added to the list of (social and political) forces mentioned.	A-Includes attention to - staying abreast of social and political forces associated with the evaluation. B&E appear relevant procedures to implementing this standard. C- The inclusion of Meta-evaluation, which can enhance the multicultural validity of evaluation, Citing A12 is good. E is appropriate, though the examples are all mainstream	“Test of their credibility” may not be the key credibility concerns of all audiences, and it ignores fundamental culturally relevant issues, e.g., historical legacy and respect.	Requires revision. See examples below: A-differentiate between “social and political forces” which connote less relevant features of the evaluation, and issues arising from factors that impact how program outcomes are valued by stakeholder-groups? It is the knowledge of how various stakeholders value key aspects of the program, which legitimates the claims of those who hold different cultural perspectives. C-have the evaluation plan and work reviewed for "cultural sensitivity" by members of the participant group, other than the team members (proposed). D-technically sound "and appropriate for the cultural context of the study" (proposed revision). F- Include cultural competence in evaluator’s qualifications, e.g., should have personal characteristics and lived experience re: the evaluation in question.

Summary of Utility Standards

U2 Evaluator Credibility: The persons conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation, so that the evaluation findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Common Errors</i>		<p>C-Ok if cultural competence is included among relevant skills and experience.</p> <p>E-The general principle of making a commitment to the study is good.</p> <p>H-Certainly issues of value differences between client and evaluator are important</p>	<p>B- is curious. As written it’s not clear how bias is a matter of <i>evaluator</i> credibility. Also, unclear is where the client or advocacy models fall here. E-How do you “devote” your reputation? A-This is not clear, but it <i>could</i> be used to argue against investing necessary time to gain entry to a community or setting, and this would not be desirable. Such investment shouldn’t be cast as an Error. H-again raises the issue of how the client is positioned (see comment on Guideline B above.)</p>	<p>Suggested revisions below:</p> <p>A- should include cultural and experiential areas as dimensions of relevance to credibility.</p> <p>B-Matters of perspective and potential bias should <i>always</i> be thoughtfully examined. The Standards should be written to support all models of evaluation, not rule some out by definition. B-The Standards should be written in such a way that they support all models of evaluation, not rule some out by definition. C-D Add cultural competence to the list. A-Some non-mainstream examples should be added—again in the spirit of getting readers to reflect on more diverse settings; e.g., American Indian reservations, homeless shelters, etc. I-Replace the word student with inexperienced assistant.</p>
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	<p>Both cases are relevant to the standard. Case 1 addresses the issue of cultural competence and sensitivity.</p> <p>This case does allude to cultural diversity but only in the non-specific terms, “minority” [students], and “minority group members” [law faculty].</p>	<p>The analysis begins with a helpful clarification that the deficiencies identified by the Professors were real, that they had not been previously recognized by the designers of the materials, and that should be corrected in the design of future materials. There is real potential in this case analysis to take up the question of when “credibility” is a code word for racism, sexism, heterosexist bias, but that is never even alluded to as a possibility.</p>	<p>Astonishingly, rather than taking up issues of institutional racism and the dynamics of achieving “legitimacy “ in the Academy, the analysis proceeds to fault the Professors for “failing to address their credibility in the design and conduct of the evaluation.” To allow this case to stand as an example of personal credibility of the Professors is to be complicit in a racist dialog.</p>	<p>While one could argue for retaining this case because it brings out the important point of lack of evaluator credibility, it needs considerable tightening to be useful and not a negative example with subtle judgments sending a message contrary to inclusiveness.</p> <p>The recommendation is for a more realistic example, e.g., have external evaluation experts perform the evaluation and conclude there were no barriers because of their lack of cultural competence.</p>
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			<p>Technical competence is conflated with credibility. U2 is written to address <i>evaluator</i> credibility, not <i>evaluation</i> credibility, the concerns are not a particularly good fit.</p>	<p>The case appears to have been included to demonstrate flagrant violation of U2 in that students assigned to do the evaluation lacked necessary qualifications and show their biases in the findings. I think it needs to be replaced with a more realistic example.</p>

Summary of Utility Standards

U3 Information Scope and Selection: Information collected should be broadly selected to address pertinent questions about the program and be responsive to the needs and interests of clients and other specified stakeholders.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	Information collected should 1) support analysis of equity issues and differential program effects and 2) be responsive to stakeholders across relevant cultural dimensions of diversity.	<i>The standard is an extremely important one, as it defines the parameters of inquiry, specifies voice and evidence. The standard itself seems appropriately written.</i>		Retain the standard.
<i>Overview</i>	The overview explicitly cites multiple stakeholders and the importance of opportunities for input. Not letting testing (as an example of a mandated evaluation procedure) drive curriculum (as an example of practice) is an issue of particular relevance to cultural dimensions of race, ethnicity, economic status, and language, though culture is not explicitly mentioned.	The discussion moves to illustrate additional variables that the evaluator should strive to include, whether or not stakeholders, in the spirit of including “all important variables”, nominate them. Overriding moral, legal, or ethical dimensions should necessarily be considered	<p>This is appropriate as a general statement of responsibility, some models of evaluation would reject vesting this much power in the evaluator. Stakeholder perspectives are repeatedly mentioned as part of the “weeding out”.</p> <p>This perspective raises interesting issues of power and ownership of the evaluation design and who shapes it. In the second paragraph of the overview, the evaluator is charged with making the judgment of what is minor (to be discarded) and what is major (to be emphasized).</p>	Retain with editing to further emphasize cultural relevance. See sample edits below: Add “equity issues” or similar variable (“fairness”, “social justice”) to the illustrative list. 2nd paragraph, third sentence, "...strives to assess the program in terms of. (add cultural responsiveness. 3rd paragraph, “ share the evaluation plan prior to data collection...” not just to address important issues but also to assess its cultural relevance to participants. The process description (p. 38, paragraph 2) seems appropriate. This is done to ensure that the information to be collected addresses the important issues “and is culturally relevant” should be added. In the last paragraph, the statement that evaluators “bring their own preferences” -emphasize that life experience, academic training, cultural identification, and area of practice shape evaluator preferences.
<i>Guidelines</i>	Guidelines reflect a cut and dry, formulaic view of synthesizing and selecting evaluation questions. This may not result in the most culturally relevant questions being included.		B-presumes that interviewing is the appropriate way to gain understanding of the view of major stakeholders. This is too narrow, given the range of strategies by which evaluators can become informed about diverse worldviews. E-puts the power of ranking the importance of potential audiences in the hands of the client. While this is congruent with some models of	Add “A. Understand the cultural context of the evaluation (see A2 Context Analysis).” H- Working across cultural boundaries to answer evaluation questions may require a more labor-intensive, time-intensive effort. If the level of evaluation effort is distributed only with consideration of importance rankings, as H suggests, the culturally relevant questions may never get the resources necessary to answer them well (unless they are top-ranked).

Summary of Utility Standards

U3 Information Scope and Selection: Information collected should be broadly selected to address pertinent questions about the program and be responsive to the needs and interests of clients and other specified stakeholders.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
			evaluation, the criteria for such ranking should be spelled out and examined for potential bias, including culturally based bias.	
<i>Common Errors</i>		B is on the right track	C a more appropriate statement would indicate that the best way to maintain an awareness of shifts in information requirements or other evaluation-relevant issues will vary with the stakeholder group, and monitoring procedures should be congruent with and respectful of the norms of each group.	B-Add “and cultural perspectives” after “multiple stakeholder groups” to underscore cultural relevance here. C-The strategy described (“periodic contacts”) is too limiting – needs expanding.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Cultural factors, especially the age of the students and what that meant for the parents were ignored.	The analyst’s view that the time frame was inadequate to the level of analysis that was desired is correct.	The textbook perfect” answer offered may not fit the circumstances. No mention of the cultural composition/ location of the district or superintendent’s purpose for requesting the report to use to compare panel choices. Since no single evaluation can address all potentially relevant questions, it’s difficult to judge the wisdom of the panel’s actions without hearing the charge.	A lot of work would be required to make this case example clearly reflect the standard. Suggest consider replacing with an example more appropriate for this standard. There is room here to add a second Illustrative Case that draws out cultural dimensions of Information Scope and Selection more clearly. Consideration should be given to adding a Standard that addresses time, beyond the reporting sense in U6. Time is a validity threat insofar as there is often insufficient time to do the front-end relationship-building necessary to support multiculturally valid evaluation.

Summary of Utility Standards

U4 Values Identification: The perspectives, procedures and rationale used to interpret the findings should be carefully described, so that the bases for value judgments are clear.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	This standard is extremely relevant to cultural diversity and evaluation. It sets the stage for examining how cultural perspectives are considered in evaluation as well as dimensions of power and privilege. It is values, more than knowledge that determines cultural understanding. Even if the approach is agreed upon, the values assigned may differ.	The standard itself is clearly written at a general level.	This standard may need to be rewritten. It leaves the impression that values are only important in the interpretation of findings, versus the entire process.	It might be desirable to connect values to the theory or logic of evaluation. It also is important to stress the importance of context and potentially conflicting values of stakeholders when assessing program merit or worth
<i>Overview</i>	Cultural competency when reflecting on values would include: 1) noticing whose perspectives are privileged and whose are dismissed. Important to review, 2) how the values identified either align with or interrupt traditional dimensions of power and privilege.	While the opening paragraph is clear, it seems written at a pretty low level for professional evaluators.	In the second paragraph of the overview, the reference to deciding who will make the value judgments and determining what procedures they will use could be expanded to point out issues of power surrounding values identification more explicitly.	A stronger closing statement is suggested in paragraph three focused on the centrality of values identification to the entire evaluation process, the importance of clearly understanding whose perspectives are/were included and whose are/were omitted from a given evaluation.
<i>Guidelines</i>			A-social norms imply a majority viewpoint. B. The complexity of who will make interpretations is not sufficiently visible. D Seems to endorse a lack of synthesis in an evaluation report.	A. "Cultural and social norms" is a more inclusive statement than "social norms" when listing bases for interpreting findings. A-B There is no one correct approach. The standards should stress analysis from multiple perspectives. C. Add one example to the list of illustrations that makes explicit reference to a culturally congruent strategy. D. Recognize different value systems by interpreting the data from several perspectives.

Summary of Utility Standards

U4 Values Identification: The perspectives, procedures and rationale used to interpret the findings should be carefully described, so that the bases for value judgments are clear.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Common Errors</i>	The errors are all important when considering cultural relevancy.	A. This is very important when considering cultural relevancy in evaluation.	D. As stated it could be used to shortchange time needed for values clarification, although sufficient time should be devoted to data analysis. E. Rules that may appear arbitrary to someone unfamiliar with the culture may in fact have deep cultural significance.	B Add “cultural” to the list of illustrative perspectives in parentheses. E- Look for a more appropriate term than “arbitrary” to describe the decision rules of a given stakeholder group. E. Overlooking or failing to educate oneself in significance of values imbedded in culture should be listed as an additional Error.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	The case analysis does not explicitly address racism, but it does point out the different value perspectives that were relevant to determining the value of this program and hints at the diversity that also exists within a perspective	The selection of an illustration that has cultural dimensions is a strength of this case, but question if Ebonics is still a timely example.	The majority value position concerning Ebonics is never spelled out. Does it reflect an attempt to respect the children’s cultural expression? Is there an he unwitting condescension that this English was “less than” Standard English? A technical question about the cultural validity of the standardized test norms gets lost in the mix. Value positions supporting the program are not specifically discussed, nor are the values of the Board members and the Superintendent.’’’	More could have been made of the importance of synthesis, not just asserting that a consensual decision could not be made and leaving it at that. If Ebonics continues to be used, it should be updated with the best current references and research. Affirmative action, sex education, and drug abuse prevention programs are all fertile examples on which strong values are held, and perhaps better choices for an example.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Good attention to age diversity and rural location in setting the context for this case.	This example has the potential to address issues of inclusion, engagement versus token representation power and authority—all missed opportunities in this analysis -- a great teaching example	The values of the older adults never mentioned. This group disappeared from decision making when “an agreement is reached.” Analysis of case never notices the disappearance of older adults from the process, praising evaluators for inclusion of two open sessions and negotiating the values among the most powerful stakeholders.	The term “handicapped” should not be used to refer to persons with disabilities. If case is used, note the omission of the older adult community in the negotiations Supporting documentation on age discrimination should accompany this second case example.

Summary of Utility Standards

U5 Report Clarity: Evaluation reports should clearly describe the program being evaluated, including its context, and the purposes, procedures, and findings of the evaluation, so that essential information is provided and easily understood.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	Clarity in reporting is essential to cultural relevancy. Issues of language, translation and oral versus written communication styles should be addressed.	Standard is appropriate as currently written, although context could be expanded to include mention of culture as well as other dimensions of context.	The standard implies that there is a single report and audience. Translation practices should be followed. Visuals should be culturally congruent with the setting.	Suggest adding, “Provided to and easily understood by <i>multiple stakeholder audiences.</i> ”
<i>Overview</i>			Focuses the reader’s attention on matters of written communication. “Clarity” is given an explicit definition whereas “understandable” is not. The discussion positions audiences as passive recipients and risks overestimating the extent to which a message is understood or accepted.	This overview could benefit from revision to expand attention to non-written communicative strategies and to matters of clarity that extend beyond linguistic translation.
<i>Guidelines</i>	A) Should be expanded to include cultural considerations making reporting mechanism more or less appropriate for a given audience. (H) is extremely important to the multicultural validity of reporting. It is important that fairness is included.	B) Is quite specific, and a good fit with many audiences. (C) The idea of tailoring reports to audiences and using multiple media is good and culturally relevant. (I) Is good to mention explicitly, although separate out oral from written translation so that appropriate methods of forward and back-translation can be cited for written translation though not needed for oral.	B) Direct and to-the-point communication is not always culturally appropriate. D) Is expressed in terms of report content, so it should also reference U3 Information Scope and Selection. Cultural context should be named. F) Technical language can create a lack of clarity, but the suggested strategies all appear one-sided (evaluators educate audiences however, audiences also educate evaluators.) It is not clear whether the referent is for “problems of the program or problems of the evaluation There should be explicit reference to signed language so that the reader is reminded that it is not only a matter of spoken language.	A & B) A new guideline could be added that makes it clear that cultural dimensions should be considered in determining the most appropriate media. The guideline could be cast a bit more broadly to call attention to dimensions rather than stating that brief, simple, and direct are <i>always</i> the correct attributes. Also an additional Guideline to address the cultural context of the report itself and of the reporting process E) This one could be expanded a bit to point to “culturally congruent and practice-relevant examples” but the intent of this Guideline is solid; keep it grounded in the real world of the stakeholder audience.

Summary of Utility Standards

U5 Report Clarity: Evaluation reports should clearly describe the program being evaluated, including its context, and the purposes, procedures, and findings of the evaluation, so that essential information is provided and easily understood.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Common Errors</i>			General concern that there is an implied assumption of privilege or sophistication on the part of the evaluator knowledge of technical skills. Tends to set up false dichotomies (precision vs. clarity or methods vs. findings)	Avoid the implication that evaluators have a sophistication that might set them above their audiences. The technically infused report is suggested as privileged.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			These cases are both skeletal and similar. This case fails to give any contextual background, characteristics of district, the Board, the evaluators, the students, etc.	It would be helpful if the analyst had specified how the Board environment shaped his/her format suggestions.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Minimal context information is provided nor the topic of the training program known, without which it is impossible to determine relevant cultural considerations. Neither case brings out cultural dimensions of report clarity well.	The idea of a multimedia presentation using visual displays and graphs seems congruent with instructional design in a business environment, though the point is not made that the analyst is seeking to match communicative strategies to the (organizational) culture of the setting. There is clearer reference here to the busy world of professionals and to the fact that written material (especially lengthy written material) may not be the most effective communication strategy	These cases are both skeletal and similar.	

Summary of Utility Standards

U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination: Significant interim findings and evaluation reports should be disseminated to intended users, so that they can be used in a timely fashion.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	Time is a matter of great relevance to cultural competence. This standard, as written, does not do it justice.		This standard seems unnecessarily restrictive in terms of the dimensions of time it addresses, the focus on results-based issues of time to the exclusion of process-based issues, and the attention to intended users as opposed to broader audiences.	A separate standard on matters related to time and timing, apart from the dissemination issues that this standard takes up should be considered. However, a standard on dissemination issues is still important to retain.
<i>Overview</i>	Communication should consider the time orientation and decision-making procedures of the stakeholder audiences and select strategies that are culturally congruent with this setting. The discussion of responsibility and control over the dissemination process is an extremely important, culturally-relevant discussion.	The overview is better in addressing the issue of entitlement; -- who is entitled to see the results of the evaluation. Another positive point is the inclusion in (item 4) of those who provided information to the study as a group entitled to receive results. There is also (in item 5) a broad definition of stakeholder audiences. The need to tailor a report to fit cultural practices is acknowledged, along with the potential need for language translation.	The justification for stakeholder categories is not well presented, making the listing of potential stakeholder categories—parents, students, and media—less than useful. Overall, this standard tries to encompass too much. It is not fully successful in the areas of timing and actual strategies.	This standard would be more effective if divided into more than one.
<i>Guidelines</i>	These rational, linear “ground rules” reflect a majority perspective and may be culturally incongruent. (F) This meta-evaluation guideline should cross-reference A12. While not explained in this way, it is potentially a very relevant	(B) <i>If</i> one is operating with the presumption of a report and in a linear, monochronic time frame, these are reasonable guidelines	These questions <i>assume</i> that a report is desired. (J) This one frames —diversity as a “social impediment!” (H) Could definitely be used to support cultural competence. What else besides clarity and factual accuracy would be important to note? As in (A), it does not address how appropriate representatives might be identified. The notion of fixed time frame again here,	(J) Definitely needs to be rethought and reworded. Instead of casting diversity as a barrier or impediment, it should speak to drawing upon the strengths of cultural traditions and practices in identifying the most appropriate communicative strategies and timing information exchange.

Summary of Utility Standards

U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination: Significant interim findings and evaluation reports should be disseminated to intended users, so that they can be used in a timely fashion.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
	tool to enhance cultural competence.		against which some release of findings, could be judged to be “premature.”	
<i>Common Errors</i>	(A) Has potentially important implications for cultural competence, though it does not address the issue of how include a constituency as an intended user if the intention is to exclude. (G) Touches on similar issues.	(E) is actually a very significant point that almost gets buried here. It speaks to Scriven’s notions of overrides when synthesizing evaluation data.		(E) The key issue would be to have civil rights, social justice, and equity issues seen as potential overrides that would be viewed in the same manner and with the same response as the violations listed.
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			The discussion of dissemination could be illustrated with a case that draws out dynamics of power better than the cases provided. Other than the fact that the setting is a school, no context information is provided at all.	The analysis gives the impression that there is only one right way to move through this scenario, and that the correct path is easily discerned by an outside observer.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>		There is a slightly greater complexity in this case. The links to U3 Information Scope and Selection and A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information also seem appropriate.		

Summary of Utility Standards

U7 Evaluation Impact: Evaluations should be planned, conducted and reported in ways that encourage follow-through by stakeholders, so that the likelihood that the evaluation will be used is increased.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Standard</i>	This is an extremely important standard. While not framed in terms of cultural competence, it could be read as a mandate for such, given that cultural competence is understood to maximize the likelihood of evaluation use (an untested hypothesis)		Influence of evaluation should be understood in the context of cultural diversity and economic and social justice, examining both intended and unintended influences over time.	Retain.
<i>Overview</i>			The overview sounds condescending of program persons. The evaluator is portrayed as a helper who can show them the way, rather than as a consultant or collaborator who can work with program persons and stakeholders to explore different options. This discussion also assumes that impact is positive, failing to consider evaluations that may be experienced as negative by certain stakeholders.	Most noticeable is that standard is grounded in a traditional definition of use that is exclusively results-based. It should be updated to reflect broader constructions of evaluation influence.
<i>Guidelines</i>		C- is headed in the right direction, but with the caveat that “open, frank, and concrete” may not be the defining characteristics of culturally competent communication in a given context. E- is well written and communicates greater respect for stakeholders in that there is no implied power differential with evaluators.		F-The broader message here should be that one must attend to cultural context in determining the mix of communicative strategies that will be appropriate and effective. G-should be rewritten to broaden the conceptualization of ways in which evaluators can work with stakeholders to support the impact of their work.

Summary of Utility Standards

U7 Evaluation Impact: Evaluations should be planned, conducted and reported in ways that encourage follow-through by stakeholders, so that the likelihood that the evaluation will be used is increased.				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<i>Common Errors</i>	D and H speak to the roles of client vs. evaluator and connect with conversations on evaluator role and evaluation recommendations. These conversations are culturally bound in an organizational or community rather than personal demographics.	(A) correctly notes that it is an error to communicate disrespect for stakeholders; yet as (E) points out, issues of influence are complex. Clients and stakeholders may hold perspectives, values and worldviews that are very different from those of the evaluators. (C) is an important caution, citing U4 Values Identification.	The language of G should be rethought to eliminate the word “target” which projects power issues as well as safety vs. harm; the idea of maximizing impact by attending to the needs of specific stakeholder audiences is fine.	G. eliminate “target.”
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Because the case contains no cultural information, the analysis cannot explore the possible influences of similarities and/or differences in age, race, gender, education, etc. within the parent group and between the evaluator and parents.	Good that a case illustration of negative influence is provided, though the case analysis itself does not explicitly make this point.	The analysis does not take up this broader issue of ideological congruence between evaluation and evaluand.	
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Too general. Information is needed on the relevant “physical and/or verbal behaviors being observed, along with the specification of what “trainee characteristics” were examined to determine the reasons for lack of progress.	The inclusion of a positive example is a plus. Readers can see what the authors view as compliance with a standard; most of the cases illustrate violations of standards	The perspectives of the trainees themselves are not represented in the illustrative case nor queried in the analysis. Impact on the consumers was also not considered	Revise or rewrite.