

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A1 Program Documentation:</b> The program being evaluated should be described and documented clearly and accurately, so that the program is clearly identified.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Program documentation helps define the evaluand and establishes its cultural and historical context			
<i>Overview</i>		Emphasis on gaining in-depth understanding and the connection to validity issues	Cultural dimensions are not explicitly mentioned	Cultural dimensions should be explicitly mentioned
<i>Guidelines</i>	To support validity of their observations, independent observers should be culturally competent	Focus of the overview is correctly on obtaining a “a valid characterization of a program.”	Insufficient cultural context in description adversely affects validity	Include adequate cultural context in portraying evaluand. This should be modeled in the case illustrations. Community and participation descriptions of program in newsletters, articles are relevant materials and should be included.
<i>Common Errors</i>		Common Error D is one of the few places in the text that emergent designs are acknowledged or addressed	Common Error E creates a false dichotomy reflecting the linear thinking of preordinate designs.	Change wording to “Viewing program documentation as an exclusively front-end activity and failing to document changes as program unfolds.”
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>		Lists of a number of potentially useful data collection strategies	Neither case really illustrates the complexities of this standard: e.g. the evolving understanding of program descriptions or how different perspectives are synthesized into a single coherent description	Needs to be replaced
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Same as above	Same as above

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A2 Context Analysis:</b> The context in which the program exists should be examined in enough detail, so that its likely influences on the program can be identified.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Has the capacity to address cultural context thus improving cultural competency within current standards structure	The standard itself is clearly worded	However, it presents the influence of context on program as unidirectional when in fact there may be important bi-directional relationships to consider	Expanding A2 should be a key focal point of the effort to promote appropriate infusion of cultural diversity into the Standards.
<i>Overview</i>		Casts an appropriately broad net around context (though cultural context absent)	Written from an experimental perspective that is especially jarring because it is an unexpected juxtaposition	Rewrite from qualitative, cultural anthropological perspective
<i>Guidelines</i>			These extremely relevant and important guidelines have been narrowly operationalized.	List of illustrative sources should be expanded beyond archival sources to include living histories, conversations, and direct observation
<i>Common Errors</i>		Supports contention that ignoring cultural context is an error	Underwritten in current form	Identify additional errors such as taking a majority perspective as truth, failing to understand the historical context of evaluation, and failing to explore the diversity within culturally diverse subgroups
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			As an illustration of context analysis, this is a very thin case, offering neither rich detail or deep understanding	Needs to be replaced. One of the case studies should directly examine an evaluation in which the "participant culture" was drastically different from that of program staff and or the evaluation staff.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Same as above	Same as above

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A3 Described Purposes and Procedures:</b> The purposes and procedures of the evaluation should be monitored and described in enough detail, so that they can be identified and assessed.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	The stated purposes and procedures of the evaluation should be examined for culturally-bound sources of bias and corrected for fairness	This standard supports meta-evaluation by requiring clear description of the purposes and procedures of the evaluation. The reference to monitoring the purposes and procedures acknowledges the fact that they may evolve and change as the evaluation progresses. The fact that purposes is plural sets the stage for exploring overt and covert purposes as well as purposes viewed differently by different stakeholders		
<i>Overview</i>		This overview is among the better-developed ones in the Standards volume	Culture is still missing from the picture of what should be monitored and documented	Procedures of data collection, analysis, and reporting need to select and handle cultural variables responsibility
<i>Guidelines</i>			Guidelines ignore process-based influence, unintended influence, and stakeholder conception beyond those of client	Guidelines should pay attention to process-based influence, unintended influence, and stakeholder conception beyond those of client
<i>Common Errors</i>			What's missing is the link between the alleged purposes of the evaluation and the evaluation questions.	Scrutinize, describe, and document how the purpose of the evaluation is translated into evaluation questions
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			In the illustrative case, an overtly sexist male principal blames female evaluator for compromising the study.	This offers the opportunity to scrutinize dynamics of power and gender in this section

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A4 Defensible Information Sources:</b> The sources of information used in a program evaluation should be described in enough detail, so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Information gathered should reflect multiple cultural perspectives and be credible to multicultural audiences	By calling for scrutiny of the adequacy of information sources, the standard creates a framework for examining the balance of majority/minority viewpoints in an evaluation. “Sources” is appropriately plural, directing attention to triangulation of information sources.		Clearly, we need to undertake a more thorough review of literature to come up with culturally-relevant documentation
<i>Overview</i>		Reaffirms value of multiple sources	Overview is poorly written. It is choppy, lacks clear logic development, and repeatedly strays from information sources to information gathering strategies	Explore the concept of culturally defensible information sources. Add the following after the second sentence of the overview, "Using a variety of data sources will more accurately capture the depth and diversity of the program and its participants."
<i>Guidelines</i>			Continues to conflate information sources, sampling frames, and data gathering procedures.	The narrative needs to separate these issues into separate standards
<i>Common Errors</i>		Recognizes that any single info source is necessarily imperfect and limited	The fact that what is considered to be a “defensible information source” and how that judgment is “defended” varies across stakeholders and may be culturally bound is missing from this standard	Explore the concept of culturally defensible information sources
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			While this is a pretty good illustration of F2 it really does little to explore the information sources themselves	Provide information that would allow the reader to reflect on whether the choice of sources was defensible or whose perspectives might have been omitted
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			This case illustration and especially its accompanying analysis pretty much misses the whole point of the standard	Needs to be replaced

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A5 Valid Information:</b> The information gathering procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented so that they will assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the intended use.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	The crux of cultural critique is all about validity	On the positive side, validity is tied correctly tied to use, though here again, it should broaden the conversation to include unintended as well as intended uses	Unfortunately, the standard is written to focus narrowly on measurement validity, specifically, the choice/development of measurement tools and the implementation of data gathering procedures. This is too limited a perspective on validity.	Broaden the construct of validity
<i>Overview</i>	Validity requires cultural competency of the evaluator	This Overview is richer in detail than many of the others; hence there is more to critique but also more room to revise and insert cultural considerations	Culture is not addressed, though it saturates every element in this process: the definition of the constructs; the types of information to be collected (from whom and how); the procedural steps followed; the data synthesis, scoring and interpretation; and choice of particular justifications to support validity.	Update source documentation and introduce cultural context into discussion
<i>Guidelines</i>		This standard, while making only limited explicit references to culture, is one of the better ones in terms of level of detail and development. The overview and guidelines actually extend the scope of the standard itself and the link between culture and validity is outlined if not fleshed out.		Make explicit references to culture
<i>Common Errors</i>	Culturally competent persons should use procedures developed and validated on minority populations.		Text suggests a top-down view of stakeholder participation necessary for validation. Not only is rote repetition of categories simplistic, it also implies that only “special” or	Text needs to be written suggesting that it is an error for evaluators to be uncollaborative and disrespectful of subjects in their quest for validity.

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A5 Valid Information:</b> The information gathering procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented so that they will assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the intended use.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
			“handicapping” conditions need be considered.	
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>		This is a pretty straightforward example of failed content validity. Given the complexity of the topic, a more challenging example would have been more useful. I do like the fact that the illustration avoids statistical jargon and symbols that could make the example less accessible to some readers.		
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Description about focus group methods and analysis using codes from majority literature call case into question	

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A6 Reliable Information:</b> The information gathering procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented so that they will assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for the intended use.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Consistent information free of measurement effort so that differences and similarities both within and among dimensions of diversity can be assessed.		Refers only to measurement reliability. This is just the tip of the iceberg	Should make reference to other types of reliability and establish the link to multicultural validity
<i>Overview</i>		Good general non-technical definition that alludes to cultural diversity issues	Procedures utilized should assure that the information obtained is reliable for the intended population and use.	
<i>Guidelines</i>		Expands the scope of the standard to address concerns of evaluator and stakeholder perspectives more clearly than many other standards.		Guideline A, add the following example after the first sentence, "Generalizing procedures across culturally diverse contexts may be inappropriate.)
<i>Common Errors</i>	Caution that evaluators are unable to step outside their cultural context and experience	Focuses on important general principles and technical considerations		Keep as written
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Lack of cultural context limits exploration of challenges contained in description and analysis	Rewrite to provide more cultural context
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			This analysis misses an opportunity to examine the influence of evaluator perspective, training, and previous experience.	Rewrite to examine the influence of evaluator perspectives, training, and previous experience

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A7 Systemic Information Control:</b> The information collected, processed, and reported in an evaluation should be systematically reviewed and any errors found should be corrected.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Quality assurance should include safeguards that check for culturally offensive format or content. Equitable access to information should be assured.		Omission of “control” from title is a distracting typo	Correct typo
<i>Overview</i>		The overview addresses training, data security, data control, and accuracy checks to avoid tampering and maximize completeness and accuracy of data.	It doesn’t explicitly address errors of perspective that could also affect the accuracy or completeness of the data	Support a quality control review of method to insure that both majority and minority perspectives are adequately addressed
<i>Guidelines</i>		(G) is particularly important to support multicultural validity. It is good that this guideline emphasizes the need to routinize such procedures and to allocate time to do so.		Any quality control plan should specifically address potential cultural bias.
<i>Common Errors</i>		Covers a wide range of potential problems, technical points, and interesting caveats.		Keep as written
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Focuses on a mechanical failure that does not immediately signal cultural relevance. Has a dated feel.	Needs to be replaced
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Cultural dimensions of information control are not addressed in the description or the analysis.	Needs to be rewritten



## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information:</b> Quantitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Analyze quantitative info to make visible both differences and similarities within /across cultural dimensions to avoid simplistic stereotyping or dichotomous thinking.	Assuming that quantitative information is relevant to answering the questions that have been posed, the standard itself seems appropriately written.		Keep as written
<i>Overview</i>			The vagueness of some of the general statements may not give proper guidance re the appropriate analysis of quantitative information	The standard would be strengthened by adding content on the appropriate treatment of race and gender in quantitative analysis.
<i>Guidelines</i>		Recognition of difference between statistical and practical significance This should go further.	Narrow analyses reinforce stereotypical differences among groups	A separate guideline might advise evaluators to explore diversity within cultural subgroups and similarities among minority and majority groups rather than only analyzing difference between control subgroups.
<i>Common Errors</i>		Important implications for the use of standardized tests in “high stakes” situations	Implies that certain stakeholder audiences are incapable of understanding the results of complex analysis. Key concepts need to be recast to include cultural relevance.	Add 2 more: "Allowing the quantitative analysis of the program to be distorted because qualitative factors like culture are inaccurately captured" & " Failing to disaggregate the data for subgroup analysis, which would capture differences in subgroup behaviors and performance."
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Illustrates an error in design, not an error in analysis	Needs to be replaced
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>		Addresses gender	The statistician did not appear to focus on the evaluation question of primary interest; the suggestion regarding increasing parental education is a bizarre departure from the policy decision at hand.	Needs to be replaced

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information:</b> Qualitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.				
	<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 especially relevant to cultural diversity as many culturally congruent methods use qualitative information	As in A8, one must assume that the information was well-selected and is relevant to the evaluation questions posed. If this is the case, then the standard itself is appropriately stated.		Keep as written
<i>Overview</i>			The description of appropriate qualitative analysis is limited to the construction, verification, and interpretation of categories sufficient to answer evaluation questions.	Just as the quantitative analysis standard alludes to many types and levels of analysis, A9 should be written to communicate that there is more than one appropriate strategy for analysis of qualitative information
<i>Guidelines</i>			Because of the narrow definition of qualitative analysis, guidelines are also restricted.	Expand definition of qualitative analysis. One way to do this would be to pay attention to epistemological diversity of the JCSEE writing and review panels.
<i>Common Errors</i>	Cultural competency should be included in considerations of “degree of expertise”		The qualitative/quantitative dichotomy may no longer be the most relevant structure for organizing analysis and interpretative standards.	Consider alternative structures for organizing analysis and interpretative standards. Add "Failing to recognize the direct influence of the evaluator's perspective in assessing the program."
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			The “detailed case study” data were not examined. If more cultural info were available, it would permit deeper reflection over the dynamics of position in this illustrative case.	Rewrite to examine “detailed case study” data.
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>		The case illustrates how the values of the evaluator may create a self-fulfilling prophecy when appropriate analysis procedures are not followed.	Because only pedagogical background is provided, that is all that is visible. In the analysis; however were cultural background available, it might shed light on additional value-based assumptions that permeate this research.	Rewrite to make more cultural background available and correct typos

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A10 Justified Conclusions:</b> The conclusions reached in an evaluation should be explicitly justified, so that the stakeholders can assess them.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	The value justifications supporting conclusions should be explicated so that the culturally-bound nature of assumption is visible.	This is a clear statement of the importance of justifying claims and of stakeholder inclusion in assessing justification.	It is vague regarding what stakeholders are assessing, which is, ultimately, validity	Make clear that stakeholders are ultimately assessing validity
<i>Overview</i>	This is a particularly relevant standard from the perspective of culture	The inclusive definitions of conclusions, covering both judgments and recommendations are good.	The attention to values is insufficient	Pay more attention to values
<i>Guidelines</i>		This is appropriately framed as a validity issue and the link to both questions and to procedures and data.		Keep as written
<i>Common Errors</i>		Agree strongly with the importance of capturing unintended outcomes	Definitions of concepts such as “sufficient” and “soundness” are not adequately operationalized.	Rewrite operational definitions of key concepts
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>		The case analysis notes the obvious but I agreed with the evaluator’s logic.		Keep as written

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A11 Impartial Reporting:</b> Reporting procedures should guard against distortion caused by personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation, so that evaluation reports fairly reflect the evaluation findings.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Reporting should fairly reflect the multiple cultural and value perspectives of the constituents in this context.	This standard is extremely important to issues of justice and fairness that intersect culture, but it is quite a bit more complex than its current wording.	The current presentation of this standard frames impartiality as a micro issue. In so doing, it understates the range of distorting influences which may include macro or mezzo issues.	Rewrite to state that the range of distorting influences may include macro and mezzo issues
<i>Overview</i>	The standard is extremely important to issues of justice and fairness that intersect culture	The overview appropriately frames distortion as a limitation of perspectives, yet still implies that it results from a personal flaw—	Given the complexity of these issues, the overview seems skimpy and underwritten. It also seems to single out formative evaluation procedures of continuous reporting and ongoing program improvement, implying that formative evaluation is somehow more subject to distortion than is summative..	Need an overview that explores relevant issues in greater depth
<i>Guidelines</i>		It gives important attention to alternative interpretations and recommendations with appropriate cross-listing of A10 Justified Conclusions.	Guidelines seem biased toward written reports which are not always the most culturally appropriate choice.	Provide guidelines for a wide range of reporting modes
<i>Common Errors</i>		Appropriately suggests that assumptions of “neutrality” should always be interrogated.	Alleged “common errors” do not apply equally to all models	Rewrite this standard so that it does not privilege certain models over others
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			The analyst takes an arrogant, authoritarian perspective, elevating the views of the evaluator above those of the program personnel.	Both the case and its analysis need revision. Add an Illustrative Case that highlights the influence of contextual factors. For example, a community that resisted the evaluation because the evaluators were perceived as not understanding or respecting the community, may reject conclusions inspired by justification offered.

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A11 Impartial Reporting:</b> Reporting procedures should guard against distortion caused by personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation, so that evaluation reports fairly reflect the evaluation findings.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>			At best, the case gives incomplete justification for a dubious action, applauded by the analyst who sees over-involvement as a common “trap” of formative evaluation.	Like the first case, this second illustrative case does not strike an impartial stance. It is biased against formative evaluation in general and participatory models in particular, and it should be revised.

## Summary of Accuracy Standards

<b>A12 Metaevaluation:</b> The evaluation itself should be formatively and summatively evaluated against these and other pertinent standards, so that its conduct is appropriately guided and, on completion, stakeholders can closely examine its strengths and weaknesses.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTHS AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>Standard</i>	Metaevaluation should be carried out in culturally competent ways, congruent with the Standards suggested above.	Formative and summative are treated evenhandedly.		Keep as written
<i>Overview</i>	Cultural critique should become a routine part of metaevaluation.	The overview of this standard is well developed.	Internal meta-evaluation should not be framed as the default, to be used only when resources are too scarce to mount an external meta-evaluator	It's important to point out that there are many different levels of depth or intensity of meta-evaluation just as there are in evaluation itself.
<i>Guidelines</i>	Cultural competency of meta evaluator should be included under credibility		The Guidelines, taken as a whole, apply more to summative than to formative and appear to have been written from a summative perspective.	Present a balanced perspective on internal and external metaevaluation
<i>Common Errors</i>	Reflections on cultural competency demand a metaevaluative stance	Agree that meta-evaluation should be incorporated in early thinking about evaluation	Disagree that external meta-evaluation should be privileged over internal in all instances	Present a balanced perspective on internal and external metaevaluation
<i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i>			Some of the logic that underpinned the action steps is puzzling.	Needs to be rewritten.