

Priority Recommendations

The following tables present the priority recommendations for actions to revise, change or add to *The Program Evaluation Standards* (2nd ed.). Priority levels are based on the intensity of the concerns expressed by the cultural readers; the ratings were assigned by the task force members who synthesized the respective sections of the cultural reading document. The priority recommendations are organized into three levels, with the 1st level representing those comments deemed of highest priority and most urgent to address, the 2nd level representing strong priority for concerns that the task forces believes should be taken seriously to strengthen the overall standards' attention to culture and cultural competence. The 3rd level is important and will enrich the program standards with respect to cultural responsiveness. The task force offers these ranking to assist the Joint Committee's understanding of levels of urgency of the cultural reading comments and recommendations.

Utility Standards Priority Recommendations

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
1	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Standard	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. Standard should be revised to attend to this issue.
1	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Overview	This section needs revision: There should be more reference to consumers who are mandated into programs and those in need of /services. Also the dimensions of cultural diversity should be expanded to include economic status, ethnicity, education, sexual orientation, age, disability, etc. Finally ranking of stakeholders should be eliminated.
3	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Guidelines	Could be strengthened to expand the list of illustrative dimensions and by referencing community leadership to emphasize that more than authority figures within organizations should be identified.
3	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Common Errors	Could be strengthened by adding tokenism to the list as another error. Also the error of "failing to anticipate competing or adversarial views of program goals and objectives held by stakeholders.
1	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Case 1	Should be rewritten to add balance; There is no mention of cultural diversity, except age, implying that other characteristics are not relevant to consider. Further, a sentence about the economic status of the community or of language diversity present would appear to be relevant to the story. Does not tackle the tough issue of deciding who speaks for stakeholder groups outside of organizations or systems.
1	U1 Stakeholder Identification	Case 2	The case has so many problems (inaccurate definition of goals, participants and success, missing cultural factors, etc.) that the Stakeholder Identification piece gets lost. It would seem to illustrate a Violation of Information Scope and Selection (U3) better than U1 Also does not tackle the tough issue of deciding who speaks for stakeholder groups outside of organizations or systems.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
3	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Standard	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.
1	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Overview	Major revision required to clarify the concept of credibility, (e.g., “other characteristics”, “test of credibility”, it is more than face validity, etc). Also should include the importance of participant views and add dimensions of cultural context. Finally should highlight that credibility might be gained or lost at the onset <i>or at any time during the evaluation process</i> .
1	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Guidelines	Needs to be strengthened and clarified to elaborate on role of cultural context, e.g., add other dimensions of diversity, i.e., education, sexual orientation, age, disability, etc., to differentiate between social & political forces and elaborate discussion on “Test of their credibility”.
2	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Common Errors	Cultural competence is not adequately covered here. For example, cultural and experiential areas should be added as factors relevant to credibility.
1	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Case 1	To allow this case to stand as an example of personal credibility of the Professors is to be complicit in a racist dialog.
1	U2 Evaluator Credibility	Case 2	Technical competence is conflated with credibility. The case appears to have been included to demonstrate flagrant violation of this standard. It needs to be replaced with a more realistic example.
3 (0)	U3 Information Scope/Selection	Standard	The standard itself seems appropriately written.
3	U3 Information Scope/Selection	Overview	Could profit from editing to further emphasize cultural relevance throughout.
3	U3 Information Scope/Selection	Guidelines	Guidelines reflect a cut and dry, formulaic view of synthesizing and selecting evaluation questions. Such procedures may not result in the most culturally relevant questions being included.
2	U3 Information Scope/Selection	Common Errors	“Updating information” should emphasize need for different methods with different stakeholder groups and that monitoring should follow group norms.
1	U3 Information Scope/Selection	Case 1	A lot of work would be required to make this case example reflect the standard. Suggest replacing with a more appropriate example. There is room here to add a second Illustrative Case that draws out cultural dimensions of Information Scope and Selection more clearly.
1	U4 Values Identification	Standard	The standard is extremely relevant to cultural diversity. It should be rewritten as it leaves the impressions that values are only important in the interpretation of findings rather than the entire process. It might be desirable to connect values to theory or logic of evaluation.
1	U4 Values Identification	Overview	The overview should be expanded to emphasize the centrality of values identification to the entire evaluation process. Also the overview should be explicit in pointing out the issues of power

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
			surrounding values identification.
2	U4 Values Identification	Guidelines	Some editing and additional language would help. In A use cultural and social norms in place of social norms. A & B could stress that there is value to analysis from multiple perspectives.
2	U4 Values Identification	Common Errors	Many of the errors illustrate important considerations when considering cultural relevancy. Use of the word “arbitrary” is problematic as what appears arbitrary to someone unfamiliar with the culture could have deep significance within the culture. E-Failing to educate oneself in significant values embedded in the culture should be listed as an error.
1	U4 Values Identification	Case 1	The selection of an illustration that has cultural dimensions is a strength of this case. However, 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 are all good examples of issues where strong values are held and might be better choices for an example.
2	U4 Values Identification	Case 2	This is a good case to illustrate issues of inclusion. The term “handicapped” should not be used to refer to disabled persons. The case analysis should note the omission of the older adults community in the negotiations
3	U5 Report Clarity	Standard	The standard implies a single audience, It should be noted that evaluation reporting must be understood by multiple audiences.
3	U5 Report Clarity	Overview	The overview should explain “understandable” as well as clarity. As written, it tends to assume the audiences are passive recipients, which risks overestimating the extent to which a report is understood or accepted.
1	U5 Report Clarity	Guidelines	A new guideline could be added that makes it clear that cultural dimensions should be considered in determining the most appropriate media for report. It is important to note that direct and to-the-point communication is not always culturally appropriate.
2	U5 Report Clarity	Common Errors	There is an implied assumption of privilege or sophistication on the part of the evaluator. Avoid this implication that evaluators have a sophistication that might set them above their audience.
3	U5 Report Clarity	Case 1	Minimal context information is provided, so it is not possible to determine cultural relevance.
3	U5 Report Clarity	Case 2	Minimal context information is provided, so it is not possible to determine cultural relevance.
1	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Standard	Time is a matter of great relevance to cultural competence. As written, this standard does not do it justice. A separate standard on matters related to time and timing, apart from the dissemination issues should be considered. However a standard on dissemination issues is important to retain.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
1	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Overview	The discussion of responsibility and control over the dissemination process is an extremely important culturally relevant discussion. If this standard were split into two, one for timeliness and one for dissemination, the cultural relevance of both could be described more effectively.
1	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Guidelines	The rational, linear “ground rules” approach reflects a majority perspective and may be culturally incongruent. Guideline J frames diversity as a social impediment. It needs to be rethought and reworded. It should speak to drawing upon the strengths of cultural traditions and practices in identifying the most appropriate communicative strategies and timing of information exchange.
2	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Common Errors	The notion of over-rides in E is a very significant point and could be expanded to include issues of civil rights, social justice, and equity issues seen as potential over-rides that could be viewed in the same manner as the violations listed.
3	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Case 1	There may be dynamics of power involved, however no context is given. 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.
none	U6 Timeliness/ Dissemination	Case 2	OK as written
1	U7 Evaluation Impact	Standard	Revise. While it could be read as a mandate for cultural competence, which is understood to maximize the likelihood of evaluation use, it is not framed as such.
1	U7 Evaluation Impact	Overview	Because this is such an important standard, it should be updated to reflect broader constructions of evaluation influence, beyond a traditional definition that is results-based. Also it sounds condescending of program persons and fails to consider evaluations that may be experienced negatively by certain stakeholders.
2	U7 Evaluation Impact	Guidelines	Some revision required to broaden the scope to emphasize the importance of cultural competence in determining communication strategies and ways evaluators can work with stakeholders to support the impact of their work
3	U7 Evaluation Impact	Common Errors	In general does reflect sensitivity to cultural context. Could use minor editing, e.g., in G- eliminate use of word “target” which projects power and safety issues.
1	U7 Evaluation Impact	Case 1	Revise. Case contains no cultural information, therefore influences of similarities/difference in age, race, gender, education, etc. Also not explored is the broader issue of ideological congruence between evaluation and evaluand.
1	U7 Evaluation	Case 2	Revise or replace. Too general. Information is needed on the relevant “physical and/or verbal

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
	Impact		behaviors being observed, along with what “trainee characteristics” were examined to determine why no progress. The perspectives of the trainees themselves are not represented in the illustrative case nor queried in the analysis. Nor was impact on consumers considered

Feasibility Standards Priority Recommendations

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
3	F1-Practical Procedures	Standard	Standard generally can encompass cultural competency values, but can be enhanced by referencing cultural competence considerations as essential to respectful interaction between evaluator and the evaluation population.
2	F1-Practical Procedures	Overview	Including in the procedures list considerations of how the contexts in which the evaluation will take place and stakeholder voice will be taken into consideration and addressed could enhance the Overview. Additionally, the Overview fails to indicate that the diversity of the evaluation population may influence evaluation procedures.
3	F1-Practical Procedures	Guidelines	The guidelines fail to include cultural competence considerations and can easily incorporate such considerations in the technical qualifications to which the guidelines refer. Important omissions include: 1) cultural competency as an aspect of qualified staff, 2) the importance of considering that more time or different procedures may be needed to complete an evaluation depending upon characteristics of the evaluation population, particularly if populations are hard to reach, and 3) pilot testing evaluation procedures and instruments with samples matching the evaluation population is essential.
3	F1-Practical Procedures	Common Errors	Although generally applicable to cultural competence, through the focus on congruence between evaluation procedures and setting, Common Errors can be enhanced by explicitly stating the need to develop evaluations based cultural competence factors in addition to setting (e.g., characteristics of the evaluation population).
2	F1-Practical Procedures	Case 1	Case study and analysis include issues of cultural competency, but cursorily. The analysis is an excellent vehicle to explicitly discuss the need to attend to cultural competence issues before evaluation procedures are selected (e.g., becoming familiar with the specific characteristics of the economically-disadvantaged population).
3	F1-Practical Procedures	Case 2	Exclusion of the organizational context implies that this is not important. Considerations of power and authority were not addressed.
1	F2-Political Viability	Standard	Standard presents the importance of considering different interest groups in planning and implementing evaluation <i>solely</i> to gain cooperation, address resistance, or to avoid bias, misuse, or

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
			misapply the evaluation results by these groups. Strongly encourage modifying language to reduce privilege of the evaluator role. There is a need to include various groups as a means of addressing political issues before the evaluation takes place, making sure that the evaluator is aware of different group's stake in the evaluation, and to make sure that the evaluation does not misrepresent the perspective of these different groups.
2	F2-Political Viability	Overview	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. Cultural competence concepts and principles can be included such as giving voice to the different groups to better ensure that a group is not taken advantage of or excluded from the evaluation. The Overview fails to recognize that evaluation can seek to influence policy toward a shared goal, depending on the type of evaluation conducted.
3	F2-Political Viability	Guidelines	Incorporating the need to include as many viewpoints in the evaluation as possible and making explicit all stakeholder perspectives that were included and omitted can strengthen guidelines.
3	F2-Political Viability	Common Errors	While the Common Errors address needing to assess formal and informal organizational power structures, it fails to mention the dynamics of power and privilege. Additionally, mention of "objective" methodologies seems to advocate for one type or philosophy of evaluation. Objective methods will vary according to the evaluator's paradigm.
2	F2-Political Viability	Case 1	Minimizes the need to include all stakeholders in the evaluation. Omits discussion of political agendas, issues of power and control, and the political nature of the evaluation.
3	F2-Political Viability	Case 2	Case study fails to provide greater consideration of the two cultural dimensions that are characteristic of the evaluation population. It also omits diverse perspectives and larger political context of the evaluation.
2	F3-Cost Effectiveness	Standard	The Standard do not provide for consideration that some evaluation procedures or methods need to utilize more resources to ensure inclusion of appropriate evaluation populations and that the assessment of the costs and benefits associated with this will vary depending upon who is evaluating these costs and benefits.
3	F3-Cost Effectiveness	Overview	The Overview provides an opportunity to discuss the cultural aspects of defining cost and benefits and how these may differ by group. Allows for inclusion of Multicultural validity example, which may require more costs and resources but may be more relevant to meet the needs of the evaluation population and the evaluation task.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
2	F3-Cost Effectiveness	Guidelines	It is recommended that another Guideline be added to include stakeholder involvement in the evaluation as a necessary cost in developing the budget.
2	F3-Cost effectiveness	Common Errors	To strengthen the cultural competence perspective, it is recommended that the Common Errors add an example that culturally-competent procedures may be more time consuming, that the value of the evaluation, including an assessment of costs and benefits will vary by group.
1	F3-Cost Effectiveness	Case 1	It is recommended that a case be developed that can bring greater complexity to the conceptualization of costs and benefits from multiple perspectives.
3	F3-Cost Effectiveness	Case 2	More attention to the balance between the benefits and costs of including other stakeholders.

Propriety Standards Priority Recommendations

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
2	P1-Service	Standard	This is potentially very relevant to the issue of cultural competence since it relates to service to consumers. As a result it is a missed opportunity if it fails to clearly suggest central importance of cultural context. Removing targeted is a small change in wording with a potentially significant implication as the standard is interpreted.
2	P1-Service	Overview	This overview is tersely worded and could be expanded to provide more information. It is currently shorter than many of the overviews, which undermines the perceptions of the importance of this standard.
1	P1- Service	Guidelines	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.
1	P1- Service	Common Errors	The list is superficial and contradictory, with some entries that undermine the integrity of the Standard. 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.
3	P1-Service	Case 1	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.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
2	P2- Contracts	Standard	This standard is culturally bound and while it reflects many bureaucratic perspectives it may not fit emergent models as well. The standard should be more generic in describing the important agreements that should be in place, without specifying that they must all occur at a specific time or in a specific format.
2	P2 – Contracts	Overview	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 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.
2	P2- Contracts	Guidelines	Guidelines should be augmented with items appropriate to emergent designs and which recognize other forms of authority structures including tribal laws. Currently does not reflect consideration of cultural issues, and privileges a managerial or top down perspective in negotiations and review.
3	P2- Contracts	Common Errors	Common errors would provide an opportunity to discuss the problem of not honoring culturally based authority and negotiation processes. Revision would provide an opportunity to include matters supporting cultural competence as “important contractual matters.”
3	P3- Human Subjects	Standard	Should be flagged for rewording with a substitution for the term human subjects, perhaps a better phrase would be “participants in the evaluation process.”
2	P3- Human Subjects	Overview	The overview in its current version focuses on legal rights and protection, but the standard itself gives equal emphasis to respect . This is extremely important and often culturally defined. 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
2	P3- Human Subjects	Guidelines	Numerous revisions and clarifications are needed to have these guidelines provide clear and specific illustration of the issues relevant to the standard
2	P3- Human Subjects	Common Errors	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

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
			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.
3	P3- Human Subjects	Case 1	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.
3	P4- Human Dignity	Standard	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.
1	P4- Human Dignity	Overview	This entire standard feels underdeveloped, and could be a centerpiece of our efforts to update the standards. There is much here to build upon and it seems to be a logical place which would be accepted by the Joint Committee.
2	P4-Human Dignity	Guidelines	The language here should be more assertive and not suggest that these efforts are supplemental or less than critical to good evaluation. None of the Guidelines really tackles issues of respect for human worth and dignity and countervailing issues of prejudice, discrimination, and disrespect.
2	P4- Human Dignity	Common Errors	Standards of professionalism and confidentiality for evaluators are important and not particularly well developed. This is a key area that the Ethics Committee should attend to, in addition to DC efforts.
2	P4- Human Dignity	Case 1	The violations in the scenario are so egregious and fundamental that to me 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.
3	P5- Fairness	Standard	This standard should be revised to realize its potential for dealing with important issues of validity, fairness and justice
1	P5- Fairness	Overview	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.
1	P5-Fairness	Guidelines	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.
3	P5- Fairness	Common Errors	(C) opens a window for cultural critique by alluding to the fact that strengths and weaknesses are socially constructed, however when the standard was reworded and broadened for the second

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
			edition, the Guidelines and Common Errors (termed Pitfalls in the first edition) were not revised and broadened beyond reporting concerns.
2	P5- Fairness	Cases 1 & 2	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.
3	P6-Access	Standard	This standard had a clearer advocacy position in the earlier version of the standards and might be revised in that spirit.
1	P6-Access	Overview	This standard takes a strong advocacy stance that is wholly congruent with the values of inclusion and supportive of multicultural validity. This is an opportunity for praise of the current edition.
3	P6- Access	Guidelines	(I) should 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.
3	P6- Access	Case 2	It would be more useful to show how challenges were met rather than to present a case that appears to be without such challenges.
2	P7- Conflicts	Guidelines	(G) is troublesome, introducing potential managerial bias and implying that “agency heads” are somehow free of conflicts of interest.
3	P8- Resource Allocation	Standard	What are the appropriate (sound) accountability procedures for overseeing the expenditure of cultural collateral?
3	P8- Resource Allocation	Overview	There are some fascinating possibilities here to explore issues of cultural collateral.
2	P8- Resource Allocation	Guidelines	(D) may be appropriate as a general rule, but going with the lowest bid may not produce culturally competent evaluation. (F) is of concern because of the labor-intensive nature of inclusion and other procedures that support cultural competence, it is problematic to place too high a value on frugality.
2	P8- Resource Allocation	Common Errors	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.
2	P8- Resource Allocation	Cases	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.

Accuracy Standards Priority Recommendations

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
3	A1 Program Documentation	Standard	This standard does a good job of helping evaluators understand the importance of a clear program description.
2	A1 Program Documentation	Overview	This overview could be expanded to convey the need for cultural elements in the program description. It should be expanded to explain how insufficient cultural context in the program description can adversely affect validity.
2	A1 Program Documentation	Guidelines	These guidelines do not address how multiple perspectives are to be integrated. A few methods would be helpful.
1	A1 Program Documentation	Common Errors	Make errors associated with culture more explicit. For example, “Assuming that the majority description of the evaluand represents how it is understood from all cultural perspectives.” Be explicit that ignoring culture is an error.
2	A1 Program Documentation	Case 1	Both cases fail to capture the complexity of synthesizing multiple perspectives into a coherent description. Needs to be rewritten to address this issue.
2	A1 Program Documentation	Case 2	Develop cases that illustrate culturally relevant guidelines (as opposed to making general background references to culture.) Replace this case with a more timely example, better illustrating the evolving nature of program descriptions
2	A2 Context Analysis	Standard	There are many missed opportunities to address cultural context. Expand this standard to make cultural context explicit, pointing out the bi-directional nature of the culture/evaluation relationship
1	A2 Context Analysis	Overview	Culture is cited only as a deficit concern. The overview is written from an experimental perspective that is especially jarring because it is an unexpected juxtaposition. Rewrite from a qualitative, cultural anthropological perspective.
2	A2 Context Analysis	Guidelines	Cultural and historical context are not mentioned in A2. Expand these guidelines to include cultural and historical context plus issues of power and relationship.
2	A2 Context Analysis	Common Errors	These common errors should be expanded to include errors such as taking majority perspective as truth, failing to grasp the historical context of an evaluand, and failure to understand diversity within culturally diverse subgroups.
2	A2 Context Analysis	Case 1	This case gives very limited historical information, background and context. Only size of school is given in terms of appreciating culture. Both cases need to be developed with more detail of culture (both societal and organization—“Big C and little c.”
2	A2 Context	Case 2	This case should be rewritten to offer information on culture of corporate organization or of

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
	Analysis		participants
3	A3 Purposes and Procedures	Standard	This standard does a good job of helping evaluators understand the importance of a providing a clear description of purposes and procedures.
2	A3 Purposes and Procedures	Overview	This overview should be expanded to include culture as a dimension of documentation and monitoring.
2	A3 Purposes and Procedures	Guidelines	The guidelines should call attention to process-based influence, unintended influence, and stakeholder conception beyond those of client.
2	A3 Purposes and Procedures	Common Errors	These common errors should call attention to how the purpose of the evaluation gets translated into evaluation questions and whose values are reflected in the translation.
1	A3 Purposes and Procedures	Case 1	This case is narrowly operationalized and blatantly sexist; a female evaluator is blamed for the actions of a male administrator who violated the initial agreement. This case should definitely be replaced.
3	A4 Defensible Info Sources	Standard	By calling for scrutiny of the adequacy of information sources, the standard creates a framework for examining the balance of majority/minority viewpoints in and evaluation.
1	A4 Defensible Info Sources	Overview	This overview is particularly weak conflating information sources with data collection strategies. These issues should be separated into separate standards.
1	A4 Defensible Info Sources	Guidelines	The guidelines should address the culturally-bound nature of information sources as a dimension of adequacy. Consider separate standards on sampling and data gathering strategies so that cultural dimensions can be separately scrutinized.
1	A4 Defensible Info Sources	Common Errors	These common errors should address the culturally bound nature of what sources are considered “defensible” and how they are defended. Make a separate standard on sampling so that issues of cultural diversity can be explored/discussed.
1	A4 Defensible Info Sources	Case 1	This case describes the evaluand as controversial but gives no cultural context information regarding program, school, or district. Needs more information to reflect on perspectives included and excluded as information sources. It misses the main point of the standard and should be replaced. (It would work better as an illustration of F2.)
1	A5 Valid Info	Standard	This standard is written to focus narrowly on measurement validity, specifically, the choice/development of measurement tools and the implementation of data gathering procedures. The construct of validity needs to be broadened.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
1	A5 Valid Info	Overview	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. Rewrite.
1	A5 Valid Info	Guidelines	Replace “physical handicaps” with disability and expand the list of diversity characteristics impacting validity
2	A5 Valid Info	Common Errors	Expand the areas of cultural diversity addressed in these common errors and suggest more inclusive participation—e.g., in reviewing instruments. These common errors are somewhat elitist, top-down view implied as to who would be qualified to review instruments, procedures.
2	A5 Valid Info	Case 1	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.
2	A5 Valid Info	Case 2	This case identifies persons living in poverty but offers no opportunity to consider diversity among the population, historical context, etc. Unequal attention to staff and consumer characteristics, though both participated in focus groups. Rewrite.
1	A6 Reliable Info	Standard	This standard is written to focus narrowly on measurement reliability. It should be expanded to make reference to other types of reliability and should establish the link to multicultural validity.
3	A6 Reliable Info	Overview	Good general non-technical definition that alludes to cultural diversity issues.
3	A6 Reliable Info	Guidelines	Expands the scope of the standard to address concerns of evaluator and stakeholder perspectives more clearly than many other standards.
3	A6 Reliable Info	Common Errors	Focuses on important general principles and technical considerations.
2	A6 Reliable Info	Case 1	Lack of cultural context limits exploration of challenges contained in description and analysis. Needs to be rewritten to provide more cultural context.
2	A6 Reliable Info	Case 2	The analysis needs to be expanded to examine the influence of evaluator perspective, training, and previous experience.
1	A7 Systematic Information	Standard	The omission of “control” from the title is a distracting typo that should be corrected. Also, this standard should be reviewed for cultural bias.
2	A7 Systematic Information	Overview	The overview should be expanded to support a quality control review of method to insure that both majority and minority perspectives are adequately addressed.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
2	A7 Systematic Information	Guidelines	The guidelines should state that any quality control plan should specifically address potential cultural bias. Avoid guidelines that position the respondent passively in a process directed by the evaluator.
3	A7 Systematic Information	Common Errors	The common errors cover a wide range of potential problems, technical points, and interesting caveats.
1	A7 Systematic Information	Case 1	This case focuses on a mechanical failure that does not immediately signal cultural relevance. It has a dated feel and needs to be replaced.
2	A7 Systematic Information	Case 2	The case should be expanded to address the cultural dimension of information control in both the description and analysis.
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Standard	This standard is clearly written but it may perpetuate a dichotomy of analysis and interpretation that is not helpful
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Overview	This overview should be expanded to convey the notion that quantitative analysis includes theory-based attention to demographic subgroups, examining both similarities and differences.
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Guidelines	Narrow analyses reinforce stereotypical differences among groups. Expand discussions of practical significance and cultural context of interpretation.
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Common Errors	These common errors privilege statistical significance over practical significance. They appear to create a false dichotomy between rigor and relevance.
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Case 1	This case illustrates an error in design, not an error in analysis. It needs to be replaced.
2	A8 Quantitative Info	Case 2	The statistician in this case did not appear to focus on the evaluation question of primary interest, and the suggestion regarding increasing parental education seems a bizarre departure from the policy decision at hand. It also needs to be replaced.
3	A9 Qualitative Info	Standard	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
1	A9 Qualitative Info	Overview	Expand this overview to illustrate other types of analyses such as those based in standpoint perspective. Avoid implicit privileging of quantitative over qualitative methods.
1	A9 Qualitative Info	Guidelines	Because of the narrow definition of qualitative analysis, guidelines are also restricted. The definition of qualitative analysis needs to be expanded.
1	A9 Qualitative	Common	The qualitative/quantitative dichotomy may no longer be the most relevant structure for

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
	Info	Errors	organizing analysis and interpretative standards. These common errors need a rewrite so that they do not perpetuate this false dichotomy.
2	A9 Qualitative Info	Case 1	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.
2	A9 Qualitative Info	Case 2	Because only pedagogical background is provided, this 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.
2	A10 Justified Conclusions	Standard	This standard is vague regarding what stakeholders are assessing, which is, ultimately, validity. This point requires some clarification.
2	A10 Justified Conclusions	Overview	The overview includes inclusive definitions of conclusions, covering both judgments and recommendations. It does, however, need to pay more attention to values.
3	A10 Justified Conclusions	Guidelines	This is appropriately framed as a validity issue and the link to both questions and to procedures and data.
2	A10 Justified Conclusions	Common Errors	The common errors need to acknowledge culturally bound nature of what is considered sound, sufficient information; limitations of perspective should be noted alongside limitations of data and procedures.
2	A10 Justified Conclusions	Case 1	Revise both the case and the analysis to give the value positions of evaluator same level of scrutiny as those of program personnel.
2	A11 Impartial Reporting	Standard	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.
2	A11 Impartial Reporting	Overview	Given the complexity of these issues, the overview seems skimpy and underwritten. It also seems to imply that formative evaluation is somehow more subject to distortion than is summative.
2	A11 Impartial Reporting	Guidelines	The guidelines seem biased toward written reports which are not always the most culturally appropriate choice. Guidelines are needed for a wide range of reporting modes.
1	A11 Impartial Reporting	Common Errors	The emphasis on authority may run counter to culturally responsive models. In discussing evaluator authority/position, avoid casting participatory practices as error.
1	A11 Impartial Reporting	Case 1	The analyst takes an arrogant, authoritarian perspective, elevating the views of the evaluator above those of the program personnel. Needs to be rewritten to correct that issue.
1	A11 Impartial Reporting	Case 2	Replace or revise this case to eliminate bias against formative participatory evaluation.

Priority Recommendations Document

(Cultural Reading of the *Program Evaluation Standards*, 2nd Edition, AEA Diversity Committee, Cultural Reading Task Force)

Priority	Standard	Section	Discussion
2	A12 Metaevaluation	Standard	This standard is well written. It could be improved by inclusion of cultural critique.
1	A12 Metaevaluation	Overview	The overview devalues formative, internal metaevaluation, yet cultural competence demands such reflection. Need to be explicit about the benefits of metaevaluation in supporting cultural competence and multicultural validity.
1	A12 Metaevaluation	Guidelines	The guidelines are imbalanced toward external, summative metaevaluation. Delete 12E. Expand 12H into several guidelines so that culture can be explicitly connected to congruence of design with context, culturally appropriate measurement and data collection strategies, culturally-bound interpretations, etc.
2	A12 Metaevaluation	Common Errors	Once again a balanced perspective on internal and external metaevaluation needs to be presented.
1	A12 Metaevaluation	Case 1	This case should to develop potential for exploring politics and organizational relationships. The analysis focuses on method, procedures, and psychometric properties without ground in cultural context. Analyses take a deficit approach, looking for problems