

## Summary of Feasibility Standards

F1 Practical Procedures: The evaluation procedures should be practical, to keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>Standard.</b>	Can support respectful interaction between evaluators and program providers, such that program evaluators do not disrupt program operations more than necessary.	Pretty generic, but can be applied to cultural competence.	No specific mention of cultural competency or context.	
<b>Overview.</b>		Definition of procedures is sound.	<p>a) Procedures list fails to mention context or voice.</p> <p>b) Does not consider that diversity of the evaluation population may influence evaluation procedures: the same evaluation procedures may not be appropriate for all groups.</p>	<p>A) Recommended additions: -“determining what dimensions of cultural context are most salient” -“identifying key stakeholders”</p> <p>B) Add at end of first paragraph, “The procedures listed above should be undertaken in a manner that considers the diversity of the population served and the stakeholders.”</p>
<b>Guidelines.</b>	a) Standard allows for inclusion of cultural competency considerations and cultural sensitivity as element of qualified personnel.	<p>A) Easily allows for the inclusion of cultural competency considerations.</p> <p>F) Suggests good procedural checks</p> <p>G) Pilot testing is a good practice to promote</p>	<p>A) No mention of cultural competency as aspect of qualified personnel. Training may not be sufficient.</p> <p>C) Evaluation population or stakeholder characteristics may necessitate more time or different procedures to include in evaluation, these populations should not be omitted.</p> <p>F) Should include stakeholders representing respondents, client may be unaware of issues of timing and availability from the perspective of all relevant groups.</p> <p>G) Omits pilot testing with samples matching evaluation population.</p>	<p>A) Recommended revisions: -“Personnel should be culturally sensitive as well as trained in evaluation techniques in order to address the characteristics of diverse populations” or -“...qualified personnel in evaluation procedures and cultural sensitivity to complete the evaluation as proposed, including, but not limited to, the need to train any personnel who need it.”</p> <p>C) “...participants or respondents, <i>and every effort should be taken to balance these time and availability constraints with the inclusion of evaluation participants that may be more difficult to reach and include in the evaluation process.</i>”</p> <p>F) Recommended addition: “Check with <i>clients and stakeholders, particularly those representing respondents</i>, about the viability....</p> <p>G) Recommended addition: “...requirements,</p>

## Summary of Feasibility Standards

F1 Practical Procedures: The evaluation procedures should be practical, to keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
				<i>and whenever possible, those taking the pilot test should represent the diversity of the population.”</i>
<b>Common Errors</b>		<p>A) Good recognition of the importance of setting.</p> <p>B) Can be generally applied to issues of cultural competence and obtaining diverse perspectives in the evaluation</p>	<p>A) Does not explicitly include cultural context considerations in fit of data collection methods and analysis plan and settings.</p> <p>B) Does not explicitly refer to cultural competence as a lack of access to certain perspectives may invalidate the evaluation.</p>	<p>A) Recommended addition: “...given setting <i>or</i> cultural context.”</p> <p>B) Recommended addition “...reliable data, <b>including important diverse perspectives, work...</b>”</p> <p>Suggested Addition to Common Errors: (D) “<i>Failing to consider cultural competence in selecting evaluation personnel qualified to craft an evaluation that is congruent with context.</i>”</p>
<b>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</b>	Includes issues of cultural competency (economically disadvantaged students) and context (urban, suburban, and rural school districts).	<p>-Includes issues of cultural competency (economically disadvantaged students) and context (urban, suburban, rural school districts).</p> <p>Analysis discusses complexity and politics surrounding educational systems and interventions.</p>	<p>-Other than location and economic status, details of cultural context are not included.</p> <p>-Analysis fails to point out that student attrition could have cultural origins (e.g., migrant populations).</p>	<b>Suggested improvement:</b> -Analysis can address cultural issues that evaluators should attend to before procedures are selected. These issues can be tied in to Recommended changes to the Standard Overview (B), Guideline A, Common Error (A) and the suggested addition of a Common Error (D).
<b>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</b>	Provides opportunity to discuss contextual issues.	-Inclusion of multiple stakeholders within the organization with diverse perspectives in the evaluation.	<p>-Focus procedures and methodology, no information on cultural context (e.g., organizational culture).</p> <p>-Exclusion of context implies these considerations are not important.</p> <p>-Need for balance on design issues and communication.</p> <p>-Analysis does not address how different perspectives and power and authority addressed.</p>	-Case and analysis should indicate the steps that were likely taken to attend to and understand organizational context, including the inclusion of different stakeholders and multiple voices in the evaluation. <b>If these steps did not take place, it should have taken place focuses on the need of the evaluator to be familiar with the evaluation population and various stakeholders (Overview Recommendation (A)).</b>

## Summary of Feasibility Standards

F2 Political Viability The evaluation should be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups, so that their cooperation may be obtained, so that possible attempts by any of these groups to curtail evaluation operations or to bias or misapply the results can be averted or counteracted				
	RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY	STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN	CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Standard.</b>	Extremely important given Standard's focus on different groups' stake in evaluation.	Provides for inclusion of all groups and stakeholders in the evaluation process.	-Language suggests inclusion of groups to address evaluation cooperation and curtailing only.	-Modify language to reduce the privilege of the evaluator role and including various groups to give voice in all stages of the evaluation.
<b>Overview.</b>	Opportunity to define cultural competency as attending to and giving voice to different groups and addressing cultural dimensions of informal and formal power and authority structures.	-Well balanced between facilitating cooperation and preventing bias, misuse evaluation. -Issues of power are explicit.	-Does not address evaluation as seeking to influence policy toward a shared goal. -Fairness and equity are limited	Indicate that evaluation may be seeking to influence policy toward a shared goal, depending on the type of evaluation conducted. -Provide more on the fair and equitable acknowledgment of pressures and actions. Need for balance and control not just acknowledgment.
<b>Guidelines.</b>	Allows for the inclusion of all stakeholders and interest groups to provide voice in the evaluation process.	-Meeting with as many groups as possible before agreeing to conduct the evaluation and the public's right to know as an ethical principal are strengths of the Guidelines. -Inclusion of all stakeholders and keeping them abreast of progress and findings. -Attention to inclusion and reporting on different perspectives. -Attention to political issues and concern for various groups.	A) Context of power and authority in evaluation is understated. B) Contract review from cultural context perspective. C) No mention of including evaluation groups in data synthesis and interpretation. D) Need to build in resources to report on different perspectives.	A) Stress exploration of context of power and authority before agreeing to conduct the evaluation. ADD- "Interest groups from diverse backgrounds may not see the need for evaluation, and may resist the process entirely. Evaluators should be prepared to assuage these concerns and engage all relevant stakeholders." B) Review and amendment contract as necessary to maintain congruence between evaluation methods and cultural context. C) Add statement about stakeholder participation in data synthesis and analysis. D) Modify: "Budget adequate resources to support the inclusion of different perspectives" Add F) "Make explicit the stakeholder perspectives that were presented in the in the study and those that were omitted."
<b>Common Errors</b>	Provides opportunity to address power and political considerations of evaluation from the perspective of different	B) Organizational power structure mentioned D) Fairness in evaluation is extremely important	A) Errors can be real or apparent imbalances. B) Lack of mention of societal dynamics of power and privilege	A) "Giving the appearance or actual bias that the evaluation is biased by attending...." D) Include "...This assumption may significantly impair your evaluation,

### Summary of Feasibility Standards

F2 Political Viability The evaluation should be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups, so that their cooperation may be obtained, so that possible attempts by any of these groups to curtail evaluation operations or to bias or misapply the results can be averted or counteracted				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
	cultural groups.		D) Meaning of “objectivity” will be different depending on evaluator’s paradigm.	specifically biasing it against diverse communities.”
<b><i>Illustrative Case 1 (Description + Analysis)</i></b>	Provides an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the challenges of conducting evaluation in large complex systems, and why evaluators must continuously attend to political, historical, and contextual factors.	Demonstrates political complexity of conducting evaluation in large systems and organizations with multiple stakeholders, viewpoints, political agendas, and competing goals for the evaluation.	-No information on cultural context provided. -No inclusion of diverse perspectives such as students, parents, teachers, state.	Include information on or stress need to explore the cultural context in which the intervention and evaluation will take place. Overall, the analysis minimizes the political agendas, issues of power and control, and the political nature of the evaluation. Reference to “scheme” to assess teacher instructional skills may be misinterpreted, use “rubric.”
<b><i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i></b>	Provides opportunity to demonstrate/discuss the evaluator’s role and responsibility in working in difficult political and fiscal realities. Also can highlight the challenges and difficulty of needing/wanting to protect the interest of the students and underserved population in the face of difficult political circumstances.	Case appropriately demonstrates the political nature of evaluation work.	-Other than age and SES, cultural dimensions excluded. -Influence of age and economic status not explicitly addressed -Student, parent, community perspective are excluded -The larger political context of programs and their evaluation is not addressed.	Conflict is not always avoidable even when procedural steps to minimize it take place before the evaluation begins. In fact, the evaluation process can be a catalyst for conflict.

## Summary of Feasibility Standards

F3 Cost Effectiveness: The evaluation should be efficient and produce information of sufficient value, so that the resources expended can be justified.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>Standard.</b>	The construct of cost effectiveness is culturally-bound: whose values define cost and benefit?		-Too simplistic -The metaphor used may not fit well in other contexts.	More of the complexity of the standard needs to be presented.
<b>Overview.</b>	Provides opportunity to discuss the cultural aspects of defining cost and benefits and how these may differ by group.	-Introduces some of the complexities of determining cost-effectiveness. -States that what results from an evaluation can be intangible and valued differently by different stakeholders.	-Complexities of determining cost effectiveness are understated. -All costs and benefits cannot be known up front. -Use of “outcomes” can be misconstrued as only meaning results-based rather than more broad outcomes/benefits of an evaluation.	Standard states that what results from an evaluation can be intangible and valued differently by different stakeholders. Can use example of establishing Multicultural validity, which may require more costs and resources but may be more relevant to meet the needs of the evaluation population and evaluation task. -Broaden the elements and perspectives included in cost effectiveness.
<b>Guidelines.</b>	Provides opportunity to discuss the cultural aspects of defining cost and benefits and how these may differ by group.	Although no specific reference to cultural issues, highlights need to think about benefits for client as well as other stakeholders.	Determine the benefits of clients and other stakeholders	Add another guideline to include stakeholder involvement in the evaluation as a necessary cost in developing the budget. This practice demonstrates deliberate inclusion of stakeholders in the evaluation. -Eliminate (C) seems more relevant to F1. -Include identification of benefits and the determination of their relative importance as separate steps.
<b>Common Errors</b>	A means to underscore the fact that the benefit and value of an evaluation will be different for different groups.	-Stresses differential value allotted by different groups. -Indicates that cost considerations should not deter trying new methods, can support culturally- relevant methods and procedures.		Benefits can be maximized by full consideration of stakeholder perspectives. Add another guideline to stress that while stakeholder involvement is necessary, their level of participation should not exceed the cost effectiveness of their involvement. (E) provide example: culturally-competent procedures may be more labor intensive and time-consuming. -Add Common Error regarding differential value allotted by different groups.
<b>Illustrative Case 1 (Description)</b>	Can be use to demonstrate the complexity of cost and benefits from multiple perspectives.		-Overly simplistic -Analysis based on cost only, no consideration of issues of value	Develop case that can bring greater complexity to the conceptualization of costs and benefits from multiple perspectives.

### Summary of Feasibility Standards

F3 Cost Effectiveness: The evaluation should be efficient and produce information of sufficient value, so that the resources expended can be justified.				
	<b>RELEVANCE TO CULTURAL COMPETENCY</b>	<b>STRENGTH AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN</b>	<b>CONCERNS/ LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<i>+ Analysis)</i>			and of benefits are presented -No consideration of cultural dimensions of assessing costs and benefits.	
<i>Illustrative Case 2 (Description + Analysis)</i>	Can be use to demonstrate the complexity of cost and benefits from multiple perspectives.		-Benefits beyond fulfilling the mandate are not explored. -No other stakeholders were involved with exam selection.	More balance between the benefits and costs of developing a local exam and using the national exam is warranted (e.g., teacher time to develop and validate the exam).