Conference Sessions: Wednesday, November 6, 2002 – 3:15 pm to 4:15 pm

**Presidential Strand**

**Welcome, State of the Association, Strand Overview and Presidential Address**

Opening plenary 100 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand
Facilitators: Molly Engle, Oregon State University, AEA President
James Altschuld, The Ohio State University, 2002 Presidential Strand Chair

Conference Sessions: Wednesday, November 6, 2002 – 4:30 pm to 6:00 pm

**Presidential Strand**

**AEA Town Hall Meeting on Expansion of The Association**

Think Tank Session 101 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand
Facilitators: Molly Engle, Oregon State University, AEA President
Richard Krueger, University of Minnesota, AEA President-elect

**Conference Committee Strand**

**Chairing (or Participating in) an AEA Conference Panel? This Workshop Is For You!**

Skill-building Workshop Session 103 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG
Facilitator: George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services
Session Abstract: In the course of our daily work, evaluators constantly face client barriers rooted in fears, assumptions and misperceptions about evaluation and the utility of evaluation. Many of these fears and assumptions come from previous experiences, misinformation, political factors, or a host of other hidden issues, and can create a shaky foundation for building client-evaluator relationships. This makes it difficult to maintain lasting relationships, affects critical communication relationships during the current project, evaluation utility and the potential for repeat business. In this think tank, sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG, participants will role-play a variety of "client interaction" scenarios, involving real-world issues encountered by experienced evaluators, and discuss alternative strategies for divining and defusing the hidden issues within them. Scenarios include: managing "first contacts" with new clients; keeping current with clients' changing needs and concerns, and introducing old clients to new evaluation services.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**Building Client-evaluator Relationships**

Think Tank Session 102 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG
Facilitators: Maryann Durland, Durland Consulting Inc
Belle Brett, Brett Consulting Group
Larisa M Naples, LMN Evaluations
Session Abstract: In the course of our daily work, evaluators constantly face client barriers rooted in fears, assumptions and misperceptions about evaluation and the utility of evaluation. Many of these fears and assumptions come from previous experiences, misinformation, political factors, or a host of other hidden issues, and can create a shaky foundation for building client-evaluator relationships. This makes it difficult to maintain lasting relationships, affects critical communication relationships during the current project, evaluation utility and the potential for repeat business. In this think tank, sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG, participants will role-play a variety of "client interaction" scenarios, involving real-world issues encountered by experienced evaluators, and discuss alternative strategies for divining and defusing the hidden issues within them. Scenarios include: managing "first contacts" with new clients; keeping current with clients' changing needs and concerns, and introducing old clients to new evaluation services.
Should An FDA-like Process Be Adopted for Getting to Evidence-based Practices in Public Mental Health?

Think Tank Session 104 to be held in the Potomac I room

Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG

Facilitators

H Stephen Leff, Human Services Research Institute
Virginia Mulkern, Human Services Research Institute

Session Abstract: Health care systems throughout the U.S. are adopting evidence-based practices. This includes public mental health systems that serve primarily persons with severe and persistent mental illness. This think tank would address whether an FDA-like process involving an ordered set of evaluations that make explicit criteria for determining an intervention's safety and effectiveness should be established for public agencies to use in identifying evidence-based practices. This process would be crucial in deciding and in justifying which practices are encouraged and funded. An explicit process might also establish a fair and accessible pathway for clinicians, advocates, policymakers and evaluators to follow in demonstrating that interventions are safe and effective. The think tank would also address reasons why this might not be a good or practical idea. Participants would also be asked to envision such a process and what organization(s) might be responsible for the process (e.g., a federal agency, research collaboratives, or professional organizations, etc.).

Think Tank: What Does Capacity Building Mean Within Multi-cultural Community Evaluations?

Think Tank Session 105 to be held in the Potomac II room

Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

Facilitators

Zoe Cardoza-Clayson, San Francisco State University
Emma Sanchez Suet, Harvard University
David Campt, American University

Session Abstract: There is considerable discussion in the evaluation field related to capacity building within community initiatives. While there are numerous models for providing this support, many fundamental questions remain about the reasons for this work and if it can or should support the sustainability of particular organizations. This think tank session will focus on evaluation capacity building in diverse ethnic communities and the challenges embedded in this work. The dialogue will include discussions of cultural and linguistic competency within capacity building models.
Digital Evaluation Resources and Links to Communities of Evaluators: Spreading Information, Tools, and Support Worldwide

Demonstration Session 106 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG
Facilitators: Catherine A Callow-Heusser, Utah State University
Kathleen Bolland, University of Alabama
Jonathan A Morell, Altarum

Session Abstract: At the American Evaluation Association’s annual conferences in 1998, 1999, and 2000, the author demonstrated the ‘Electronic Resources for Evaluators’ website linking to digital resources throughout the world that are useful to evaluators or those interested in evaluation. The numerous, on-line evaluation resources include links to * individuals, organizations, and communities of evaluators, * evaluation training, jobs, and funding sources, * evaluation publications, journals, and document repositories, * evaluation tools, instruments, and data sources, and * and many other evaluation-related links. Copies of the website and links to it can be found throughout the world, demonstrating the relevance and importance of the site. With a new name and look, the newest version of the website will be discussed. This version incorporates * updated links, including over 200 additional links, * more information about what types of evaluation resources can be found at each link, and * keyword searching.

Youth Engagement in Evaluation: Opportunities and Challenges

Panel Session 107 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair: Leslie Goodyear, City Year
Discussant: Leslie Goodyear, City Year

Session Abstract: This session presents the opportunity for conversation regarding youth involvement in evaluation, its opportunities and challenges. Brief papers will be presented, representing youth development, community development and evaluation perspectives, with the goal of sparking audience discussion that contributes to and challenges the larger current conversation around promoting youth engagement in evaluation.

Engaging Youth in Evaluation, Social Transformation and Community Change: Creating Developmental Opportunities

Presenter: Andrew Munoz, City Year
Abstract: This paper examines the risks and developmental opportunities for adolescents who conduct evaluation and are expected to serve as leaders alongside adults in operating national service organizations. Two brief case studies are presented from national service organizations that have advocated equal partnership between adults and youth in decision-making. Issues of adolescent identity development and social growth are explored in relationship to utilizing youth-engaged evaluation. A typology for youth involvement participation and engagement is presented. Adolescents have problems and make developmental gains as they share responsibility for the appropriate use of evaluation in contexts of social transformation and community change.

Community Participation with Young People: Opportunities and Obstacles

Presenters: Barry Checkoway, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Katie Richards-Schuster, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

Abstract: Youth participation in community evaluation has potential for evaluation and planning, in addition to youth and community development. Despite this, youth participation in community evaluation remains relatively undeveloped as a field of practice and subject of study. This paper draws on a national effort to involve young people in evaluation, both through participatory community-based evaluation and also convening symposia representing leading practitioners, to analyze the obstacles to youth participation and the growing opportunities for future work in this field.

Bringing Youth Involvement into the Broader Evaluation Conversation: Challenges and Opportunities

Presenter: Leslie Goodyear, City Year
Abstract: More and more programs and evaluators are recognizing the value of engaging youth in evaluation and research activities. This has led to discussions of determining appropriate levels of engagement, program capacity and evaluation methods. In national symposia and local level dialogues, leading practitioners and academics are creating a framework for involving youth in evaluation. This paper addresses what can be learned by connecting this conversation to larger discussions in evaluation, including the important ways in which a youth involvement in evaluation movement needs to address, support and challenge basic assumptions behind program evaluation.
Evaluating Comprehensive Community Programs: Challenges Faced and Lessons Learned

Panel Session 108 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG
Chair  Anne F Bergan, US Department of Justice

Session Abstract  Evaluating many Federal comprehensive community-based programs can be a challenge for researchers, given the complexity and diversity of these types of interventions. The purpose of this panel is to convene four researchers that are currently evaluating four different community-based programs for OJJDP: Safe Schools/Healthy Students, the Title V Program, Drug Free Communities Support Program, and the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Program. These professionals have a well-established reputation for expertise in conducting national, multi-site comprehensive community evaluations, and can offer their own unique perspectives and experiences on this subject. Some topics that will be covered are: * What are the challenges around evaluating comprehensive community programs? * Can we apply the same scientific rigor to evaluating these programs? If so how? Or if not then why? * How do we get at impacts and what should we be measuring?

Challenges and Opportunities of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students National Evaluation
Presenter  James Trudeau, RTI International
Abstract  The Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) Initiative is a comprehensive, community-wide approach to preventing youth violence, substance use and mental health problems and promoting healthy development and safe schools. Ninety-seven sites in three cohorts have each been funded for up to three years to utilize partnerships among schools, law enforcement and mental health services to address these issues. The SS/HS national evaluation is addressing two main questions: (1) How, and at what costs, did the Initiative affect local planning and implementation of comprehensive, integrated strategies? And (2) What is the Initiative's impact on healthy development and safe school environments? Following a brief overview of the initiative, the session will describe evaluation challenges and opportunities, including studying 97 sites (and two thousand schools) with unique situations and approaches; incorporating multiple levels and sources of data (13 types of surveys; archival data collection; economic analysis; case studies); and assessing collaboration and systems integration and their effects.

Learning from Experience Implementing an Innovative Methodology: Lessons Learned From the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Title V Program
Presenter  Susan Chibnall, Caliber Associates
Abstract  There is no argument that innovative approaches and methodologies, like those being employed in the Title V national evaluation, have expanded the boundaries of community-based research and evaluation. Despite the value of these new approaches, however, effective implementation of these methods often require a level of evaluation capacity, commitment and support at the Federal, State and local levels over and above that which is required of more traditional, accountability-based evaluation methodology. As a result, evaluators are experiencing new challenges in conducting community-based evaluation. This panel presentation will provide the audience with an opportunity to learn from our experience implementing an innovative methodology in a large national evaluation.

Challenges in Evaluating the Impact of Community-based Substance Abuse Prevention Coalitions
Presenter  Ann Lamiell Landy, Caliber Associates
Abstract  The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Drug Free Community Support Program (DFCSP) provides grants to communities to implement prevention efforts tailored to community substance abuse problems to improve prevention efforts and reduce substance abuse among youth. The presentation discusses the challenges inherent in measuring the relationships between coalition organizational characteristics and outcomes for communities and youth, and also in validating the theoretical linkage between interventions, change in risk and protective factors, and substance abuse-related outcomes. We also will describe strategies used to compensate for the principle obstacles to conducting investigations of outcomes: inadequate resources for conducting evaluation at the local level; misconceptions about appropriate techniques for measuring the impact of specific interventions; and, identification of appropriate comparison data.

National Evaluation of the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Program
Presenter  Mark Wolfson, Wake Forest University
Abstract  The first major federal initiative on underage drinking—the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Program—was launched by the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in 1998. All 50 states and the District of Columbia have received funding under this program to support state and local efforts to enforce laws related to alcohol use by underage persons and to prevent underage drinking. The national evaluation seeks to determine what state and local programmatic activities are being supported by the program and evaluate the program's impact on law enforcement practices and drinking by youth in a sample of local communities. This paper discusses challenges in designing and implementing a comprehensive evaluation of this national program, including (1) lack of random assignment, (2) intervention heterogeneity, and (3) underdevelopment of the research base on which the
Achilles Heels of Program Theory Evaluation

Panel Session 109 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG

Chair Patricia J. Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
Discussant Mark W. Lipsey, Center for Evaluation Research and Methodology
Session Abstract Since the 1960s evaluators have suggested that it may be useful to base program evaluations on an explicit causal model of the program. Since then, program theory evaluation (sometimes called logic models, theory of action, theory-driven evaluation, or outcomes hierarchies) has become increasingly popular. Yet program theory has several Achilles heels—weak spots that can make it vulnerable and ineffective. In this session, evaluators with diverse experiences using program theory look at four of these 'Achilles heels' and how they can be best managed. It explores: (1) excessive focus on the expected pathway through the program and average outcomes; (2) failure to actually assess merit and worth, (3) program-centric focus that ignores the broader system of needs and influences, and (4) presumption of causality based on searching for confirming evidence. This session will constructively explore potential weaknesses in a particular approach and how these can best be avoided when implementing this approach. The session will be designed to incorporate delegates' comments and insights on each of these issues, as well as the formal presentations.

Excessive Focus on the Expected Pathway Through the Program and the Average Outcome
Presenter Bron M McDonald, Department of Natural Resources & Environment
Abstract When developing a causal model for a program, most evaluators show only one causal path leading to a single set of outcomes. Yet it is often the case that program clients follow a range of different pathways through the program, and the causal mechanisms that are important in achieving the intended outcomes may be quite different for different groups. There may also be quite different outcomes for different groups. This presentation compares different program theory evaluations: those that focus on a single causal path and an averaged description of a single set of outcomes, and those that present different causal paths for different groups, and that analyse and describe differences in the outcomes between groups.

Failing to Evaluate Merit and Worth
Presenter E. Jane Davidson, Western Michigan University
Abstract Much of the focus in theory-based evaluation is on the methods that can be used to construct logic models. However, it is considerably less clear how one should interpret evaluation data collected on the variables in these models. When reviewing examples of evaluation studies that use theory-based evaluation, a recurring theme is examining the fit of the model with the data, and/or looking at the strengths of the links between variables. While this is useful for evaluating the validity of the program theory, it falls well short of evidence that would allow us to draw conclusions about the quality or value of the program itself. This presentation will outline the additional steps needed to move from evaluating program theory to evaluating the program itself (i.e., assessing the extent to which the program met the needs of recipients in an ethical, efficient, and cost-effective way, as compared to available alternatives).

Program-centric Focus that Ignores the Broader System of Needs and Influences
Presenter MF. Smith, The Evaluators' Institute
Abstract Program theory evaluation is at grave risk of being program-centric—focusing only on the needs which the program is designed to meet, and only on the influence of the program, ignoring more systemic issues. This presentation will review examples from the literature that illustrate this issue and discuss techniques to address it, including explicitly considering and analysing the broader system within which the program and program clients operate.

Premature Causal Attribution Based on Searching Only for Confirming Evidence
Presenter Patricia J. Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
Abstract When program theory evaluation is used in the early stages of developing the evaluation capability of an agency, it is common to search for evidence that confirms the causal chain—i.e., documenting the number of people who attended activities, some data on intermediate changes, and data on ultimate activities. While this can be a useful development for agencies unused to gathering and analysing data, or to identifying ultimate and intermediate intended outcomes, there is a real danger that this will be taken to be all that is required to do evaluation, leading to poor decisions being made on the basis of spurious causal attribution. This presentation will illustrate this problem using real examples and discuss how such evaluations can be gradually enhanced to make more credible causal claims.
The 21st Century Community Learning Center Program: Challenges for Evaluators

Think Tank Session 110 to be held in the Tidewater room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Facilitators: Jerome A Hipps, WestEd
Mary Cruz Diaz, WestEd
Colin Ormsby, WestEd
Alberto Heredia, WestEd
BA Laris, ETR Associates

Session Abstract: The Department of Education's 21st Century Community Learning Center Program funds after-school programs that operate nationally at 6,800 schools in 1,420 communities. Evaluation is an important aspect of the federal program as grantees work to fulfill the Department's reporting requirements. Based on our experience working with over 80 schools in four urban districts, we have come to understand how working with 21CCLC grantees calls upon evaluators to work with broad issues of program development, support, and coordination. These demands very frequently extend beyond the evaluator's traditional role. This Think Tank session will begin with a brief presentation on the diverse roles of the evaluator. Participants will then break into smaller groups where they can discuss the issues and dilemmas that they face working with 21CCLC grantees. We will then reconvene to reflect on what we have learned and discuss ongoing networking that will support our work.

Identifying Assumptions in a Foundation's Community-change Model

Think Tank Session 111 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Facilitator: John B Bare, John S and James L Knight Foundation

Session Abstract: Foundations interested in community-change models often fail to identify and address all of the underlying assumptions. This weakens their theory of action and increases the risk associated with the investment strategy. In each of its 26 communities, Knight Foundation is working with local advisory committees to craft 'community investment plans' that articulate the desired local outcomes, the most promising theory of action for the foundation and its partners to pursue, sources for risk and the all of the underlying assumptions. In this think tank session, Knight staff will present participants with a case summary of one of its community investment plans. Participants will work through the proposed chain of logic with Knight staff, questioning assumptions and pointing out blind spots.

Use of Recommendations in Evaluation: A Decision-making Tool for Evaluators

Think Tank Session 112 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG
Facilitators: Jennifer E Post, University of Pittsburgh
William E Bickel, University of Pittsburgh

Session Abstract: Is it appropriate and useful for evaluators to use findings to make recommendations? If so, under what circumstances and how specific should they be? This session invites evaluators to validate a decision-making tool for the appropriateness of recommendations in a given evaluation context. Based on theoretical literature and a sample of evaluation reports, the facilitators present a matrix in which a continuum classifying the nature of potential recommendations is arrayed against evaluation context variables. Participants are invited to test the framework using case experiences from their own practice, adding variables to the matrix and assessing its utility. We anticipate three outcomes from the session: (1) greater clarity among participants regarding the justification of recommendations in their work, (2) a contribution to the theoretical debate regarding the role of recommendations, and (3) a tool that can be broadly disseminated to help practitioners think more systematically about the decision to make recommendations.

Qualitative Approaches to Evaluating in Educational Settings

MultiPaper Session 113 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG
Chair: James S Sass, Los Angeles Unified School District
Discussant: James S Sass, Los Angeles Unified School District
Abstract

The growing popularity and use of ethnographic methods in evaluation work has raised a concern that "good" ethnography cannot be conducted under the constraints of time-limited site-visits. Unfortunately, the reality of much contracted evaluation work is such that clients are unwilling or unable to fund lengthy fieldwork. The purpose of this paper is to offer an alternative approach to evaluation site-visits that mediates the problem of time limitations while still offering interpretive credibility and meaningful findings. We draw on an ongoing evaluation of 10 Title One Schools engaged in comprehensive reform to illustrate how multi-site, site-visits can be framed from an archeological perspective and meaningfully interpreted using middle range theories. We discuss how using such a method avoids the deep time requirement necessitated by traditional ethnographic methods and offers a viable response to the realities of contracted evaluation projects. Implications and potential limitations of using the proposed methodology are also discussed.

**Towards Reciprocal Participatory Evaluation: Knowledge-making in Mutual Border-crossings**

**Abstract**

In a monitoring evaluation inquiry of a teacher development program, run by a prestigious private school in South Africa, details of serious mismanagement and lack of leadership were elicited via document studies and interviews conducted by the team of participatory evaluators with the outside agency. The most powerful tool, however, proved to be participatory observation, which filled most of the gaps left by other tools. The thesis of this paper is that the sole use of survey interviews and documents, which characterize much of local qualitative evaluations, captures the events and activities that demonstrate progress and output only partially. We argue that evaluators that do not engage in participatory observation and who do not enter the community as "friendly strangers" / participatory observers, may not be able to capture change and to construct "rich indicators" to compose "rich descriptions". We argue for a notion of reciprocal participatory evaluation in which participants from the evaluated community move to the evaluator's position and vice versa.

**School Success and Educational Resilience: A Study of Four Schools in Southwestern Pennsylvania**

**Abstract**

The primary purpose of the study was to identify factors that contribute to successful and resilient schools in southwestern Pennsylvania (SWPA). The study aims to understand and assess influences that contribute to the exemplary nature of school success among four schools in the region. By examining the themes and constructs that surround these schools, attention is paid to understanding conditions that are required to bring about systemic educational development and improvement in SWPA. Through interviews with stakeholders at the school level (teachers, parents, students, principals, and superintendents), this study describes the factors that make a positive difference in four successful, yet challenged schools. A qualitative methodology was employed throughout the research study, one which attempted to focus on understanding contexts that contribute to underlying factors and reasons why these elementary schools were identified as exemplary. Summary and Implications. The fact that a number of primary and secondary factors play a role in the success and resilience of these four schools is noteworthy. The expectations and attitudes toward success stem from notions of discipline, orderliness, and effort. That effective school relationships and schools practices are the most important aspects of school success among southwestern Pennsylvania (SWPA). The study aims to understand and assess influences that contribute to the exemplary nature of school success among four schools in the region.
Use of Power Point to Introduce the Basics About Evaluation to a General Audience: Experiences in CARE International

Demonstration Session 114 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Facilitator  Jim Rugh, CARE International

Session Abstract  You're responsible for promoting project Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DME) in a huge international organization with 12,000 staff working in 65 countries. Periodically you're given a special opportunity: You're given 90-minute slots during staff re-orientation sessions to present what you feel these persons need to know about DME. We professional evaluators know there's a whole lot involved in good practice. What do you leave out? What do you include? How do you present it so that the audience understands and takes away with them at least some useful concepts that they can apply? To take advantage of such opportunities, Jim Rugh has developed a PowerPoint presentation that has been praised by many (within and beyond CARE). When a portion of it was shown after an AEA 2001 pre-session several colleagues asked him to offer the full show as a demonstration. So here's your opportunity to see it! (e-copies will be available.)

The Role of Evaluation in the Continuous Improvement of The After School Corporation (TASC) After-school Initiative

Panel Session 115 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair  Richard N White, Policy Studies Associates

Session Abstract  Concurrent with the inauguration of its after-school initiative, The After School Corporation (TASC) of New York City launched a six-year formative and summative evaluation conducted by Policy Studies Associates. Over the next four years, the pattern of pattern of collaboration has have produced benefits for both the initiative and the evaluation. In this session, representatives from TASC and from the evaluation team will describe the initiative and the evaluation. They will describe examples of how the evaluation, in combination with the reports from evaluations of other after-school programs, has contributed to strengthening the TASC program on multiple levels. The panelists will also discuss the mechanisms through which information from the evaluation has been most readily integrated into planning and decision-making by TASC. In addition, we will discuss how questions and challenges from TASC have strengthened the evaluation.

Evaluation of the TASC After-School Program: Overview of the Design and Results from the Formative Evaluation

Presenters  Richard N White, Policy Studies Associates
Elizabeth R Reisner, Policy Studies Associates
Jennifer Birmingham, Policy Studies Associates

Abstract  The evaluation of the TASC after-school program involves a comprehensive longitudinal design. Data are collected using multiple methodologies and sources--administrative data from TASC and the New York City Public Schools, surveys, site visits, structured program evaluations, focus groups, and interviews. The analysis database accommodates the multiple sources of data, the different levels of measurement, and the number of rounds of observations over time. One focus of the evaluation is a study of program implementation. TASC has been successful in implementation at each level of the initiative, from forging strong partnerships with the New York City Board of Education and other key stakeholders, escalating the discussion of after-school programs and funding among public and private agencies, launching at least 50 new after-school projects each year structured and providing services consistent with the TASC model, and developing an infrastructure to monitor and support participating programs in their efforts to improve.

Changes in Student Attitudes, Behavior, and School Performance Associated with Participation in the TASC After-school Program

Presenters  Megan Welsh, Policy Studies Associates
Christina Russell, Policy Studies Associates
Keith Gayler, Policy Studies Associates

Abstract  The TASC evaluation provides unique insight into the impact of after-school programs on student outcomes because it is the only large-scale study of after-school programs that compares the student-level achievement of participants and nonparticipants. This session will present early findings from the first three years of the evaluation, including comparisons of standardized test scores and school attendance rates from 1997-98 through 2000-01. Findings include that the school attendance of TASC participants improved more than that of nonparticipants, suggesting that after-school programming can increase students' attachment to school, and that more participants than nonparticipants had improved proficiency in mathematics after one year of exposure to the program. Non-academic outcomes will also be discussed, including: attachment to the after-school program, trust of project staff, life skills
development, opportunities for leadership, and interactions among peers. Finally, plans for future analyses will also be discussed.

**The Evaluation of the TASC After-school Program: How This and Other Evaluations Have Influenced the Initiative**

**Presenter**  Mary Bleiberg, The After-School Corporation

**Abstract**  Evaluations have played an influential role in all phases of the TASC initiative, beginning with the design of the TASC program model. The TASC program model integrates 10 core elements, each of which had been demonstrated through scientific research to have positive impacts on kids in various jurisdictions. Early evaluation findings, related to program implementation resulted in changes in TASC’s operational policy and practices, and adjustments in the types of training and technical assistance offered. Findings based on survey data from students, staff and principals resulted in: changes in program offerings; the creation of a staff retention/quality improvement initiative designed to identify and support staff who become interested in teaching; and the design and implementation of constituency building initiatives targeted to principals and superintendents. Findings related to student attendance and achievement will allow TASC to negotiate more appropriate performance measures as a condition of some sources of public funding.

**Use of the Evaluation to Improve Practice in the Program and the Field**

**Presenter**  Fred McIntosh, The After-School Corporation

**Abstract**  An important component of the collaboration between TASC and its evaluators is the extraction of information related to critical aspects of after-school program practice, and producing concise, focused reports that are intended to be used by individual after-school projects in their efforts to improve. These products are also intended to improve the after-school field as a whole. In collaboration, TASC and its evaluators have produced a series of Resource Briefs and Tool Kits on such topics as collaborating with principals, training and supervising after-school staff, and organizing effective sports and fitness activities in after-school settings. These products are supplemented by efforts of TASC and its grantees to identify promising practices employed by current after-school sites to be described and disseminated to other after-school programs within TASC and beyond.

---

**Reforming Welfare Reform: Analyses of Policies and Outcomes**

Panel Session 116 to be held in the Fairfax room

Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG

**Chair**  Frederick L Newman, Florida International University

**Discussant**  Julia Isaacs, US Department of Health and Human Services

**Session Abstract**  Passage and implementation of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) changed the focus of welfare policy in the United States. Instead of the entitlement to cash assistance embodied in Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) encourages economic self-sufficiency through employment. Now, six years after implementation of this major system change and with re-authorization pending, evaluators have been involved in assessing the impacts of this policy revolution and in recommending changes. This panel contributes to this assessment both by examining the changes in policies that have been observed and by analyzing the outcomes that appear to be the results of policy changes.

**Questions of What Versus How: The Limits of Research Knowledge in Evaluation of Welfare Policy**

**Presenter**  Charles McClintock, Fielding Graduate Institute

**Abstract**  An analysis of twenty years of Federal RFPs related to research on welfare, reveals the persistence of questions that help identify factors that are important in alleviating poverty, but few that examine how to implement or use those factors to achieve that end. The use of research knowledge is limited by inter-governmental and organizational context, lack of coordination across policy arenas, and cultural and value diversity. These issues require the expertise of skilled practitioners as a necessary complement to what is learned from research.

**Multilevel Models and Evaluating Welfare Reform: The Impact of Terminating Federal Benefits for Persons Diagnosed with Drug or Alcohol Addiction**

**Presenter**  Robert G Orwin, Westat

**Abstract**  In 1996, the Contract with America Advancement Act mandated the termination of the Social Security Administration’s Disability Insurance (DI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits for persons diagnosed with drug or alcohol addiction. Effective Jan. 1, 1997, the law ended Medicaid eligibility as well, leading to many chronic substance abuse patients losing Medicaid reimbursement for addiction treatment. Most studies of this change have relied on self-report, lacked comparison groups, and lacked pre-intervention data. The present study addresses this question through a longitudinal quasi-experimental analysis of administrative and cost data from former SSI/DI participants and non-participants in Washington State from 1/95 through 12/99. Using results from multi-level random-effects longitudinal modeling with HLM, this paper will present findings on the effects of the policy change on criminal activity, service utilization (health, mental health, and substance abuse) and employment.

**Appreciating the Diversity of Outcomes for People Leaving Welfare (TANF)**

**Presenter**  George J ulmes, Utah State University
Abstract
Welfare caseloads declined dramatically after implementation of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). Understanding the outcomes of this major systems change, however, requires more than describing this decline. Not only is it important to make use of multiple sources of information and employ multiple methods, it is also important move beyond aggregate analyses that report average outcomes. This presentation will illustrate several ways of disaggregating outcomes of people leaving welfare, illustrating how consideration of types of people and types of communities can provide a richer picture for better informed policy change.

Variations in State Welfare Policies: Balancing Accountability and Flexibility

Presenter
Gale Harris, US General Accounting Office

Abstract
The 1996 welfare reform legislation established federal work requirements and time limits on aid and at the same time provided states significant latitude in designing their own programs to help needy families. Information collected through surveys of state and county welfare agencies and visits to several states show how states are using this flexibility and the extent to which their choices may place many families beyond the reach of federal work requirements and time limits. The proper balance between key federal elements of reform and state flexibility will be a recurring theme as the Congress considers welfare reform reauthorization this year.
Evening Event: Wednesday, November 6, 2002 – 6:10 pm to 6:40 pm

Special Event

Evaluation 2002 Conference Attendee Orientation
Orientation Session 118 to be held in the Potomac III room
Facilitators
Jean A. King, University of Minnesota
John McLaughlin, McLaughlin & Associates
Masafumi Nagao, Hiroshima University
Molly Engle, Oregon State University, AEA President
Richard Krueger, University of Minnesota, AEA President-elect

Are you a first time AEA conference attendee? Are you returning, yet hoping to learn more about the Association and the meeting? Attend this quick orientation to learn more about selecting conference sessions, the way the conference is arranged, the structure of AEA, and how to get involved. Time is set aside at the end to ask questions of key leaders in the Association. We will leave this session together to attend the evening’s reception.

Evening Event: Wednesday, November 6, 2002 – 6:30 pm to 7:45 pm

Special Event

Information Fair and Meet the Authors Reception
Session 119 to be held in the Regency Ballroom
Generously sponsored by Sage Publications
Tables
Topical Interest Groups
Committees and Initiatives
Local Affiliates
AEA Authors

This evening’s networking reception will include tables staffed by AEA’s volunteer leaders and authors. This is your chance to ask a question of your favorite writer or peruse the newest evaluation books. You can learn how to start a Local Affiliate or Topical Interest Group – or connect with the existing Affiliates and TIGs. Representatives will be available to speak with about AEA’s Diversity Initiative, High Stakes Testing Statement, Awards Process, and Membership. You can find out how to run for the Board of Directors or speak with a Board member directly about whatever is on your mind.
Coffee and Tea Break: Coffee and tea are available on the main conference floor outside the ballrooms before and after the first session of the day.

Conference Sessions: Thursday, November 7, 2002 – 8:00 am to 9:30 am

Presidential Strand

Cutting-Edge Evaluation Methods in Organizational Settings
Panel Session 301 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG
Chair Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University
Discussant Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University
Session Abstract What are the hottest trends in evaluation in organizational settings, what can we learn from them, and what enhancements might be possible by drawing on evaluation theory, methodology, and practical approaches? In this interactive session, we will explore and critically evaluate some of the main trends in evaluation coming out of business and industry that have developed largely independently of the mainstream evaluation profession. Examples will include evaluation approaches used by leading high-performance companies such as General Electric, and a critical look at Six Sigma methodology and the Balanced Scorecard (two cutting-edge approaches to organizational evaluation and improvement). In an extensive discussion segment led by one of the evaluation profession’s leading theorists, participants will have the opportunity of exploring how evaluation theory and methodology might help take the practice of evaluation in organizations to new and more valuable heights.

How Evaluation Can Be Used to Transform Organizational Performance
Presenter Justin M Menkes, Menkes Organizational Development
Abstract Topics will include: 1) What a high performance culture looks like 2) How evaluation is essential to building the high-performance culture. 3) Some of the myths and excuses for not using evaluation in organizations. Using General Electric as an example, Justin Menkes will demonstrate how it was the application of several tools from professional evaluation that enabled General Electric’s former CEO Jack Welch to turn GE into the globally respected colossus it is today.

A Critical Evaluation of the Balanced Scorecard and Related Evaluation Models
Presenter E Jane Davidson, Western Michigan University
Abstract The Balanced Scorecard is a very popular whole-organization evaluation system currently in use in business and industry, as well as in many other sectors. Jane Davidson will critically examine the Balanced Scorecard approach, explore its links with lead and lag indicators, linkage research, and theory-based evaluation, and make some suggestions for enhancing this type of whole-organization evaluation system.

Applying Six Sigma in the Health Industry
Presenter Wendy M Novicoff, University of Virginia
Abstract Wendy Novicoff, a Six Sigma Master Black Belt whose graduate training is in evaluation and statistics, will share some of her insights from applying Six Sigma in the health industry. Dr. Novicoff will touch on such issues as measuring intangible outcomes, incorporating qualitative and mixed method data into Six Sigma, and the issue of whether approaches other than the customer-focused perspective might appropriately be incorporated into Six Sigma.

Conference Committee Strand

High Stakes Testing: Does It Reform School Systems to the Benefit of All Children?
Panel Session 306 to be held in Ballroom F
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee, Diversity Committee, and Task Force on High Stakes Testing
Chair Sandra M Mathison, University of Louisville
Edith P Thomas, US Department of Agriculture
Discussant Michael Glascoe, Fairfax County Public Schools
Session Abstract  This panel will provide an overview of the impact of high stakes testing on special populations of students and the programs that are meant to be in their interests. Specifically, the presentations will consider the intended and unintended consequences of testing for minority children, students with disabilities, and students whose first language is not English.

**Revisiting an Old Fiend: Consequential Validity and High Stakes Testing**

**Presenter**  Charles L Thomas, George Mason University  
**Abstract**  The 1999 edition of Standards for educational and psychological testing (APA, 1999), as its 1985 predecessor, confined its consideration of unintended consequences of testing as a source of invalidity to only those cases where it can be determined that construct under-representation or construct-irrelevance exists in test interpretation. This paper will examine some of the implications of this restriction in the context of high stakes testing.

**State Testing and Students with Disabilities**

**Presenter**  Eileen M Ahearn, National Association of State Directors of Special Education  
**Abstract**  Over the past decade there have been a number of changes in assessment policies and practices for students with disabilities. There are three major issues in the assessment of students with disabilities: rates of participation in assessments, alternate assessments, and the reporting and use of assessment results. This presentation will discuss the assessment practices currently in place, recurring issues, and the impact of testing on students with disabilities.

**High-Stakes Testing Environments: The Impact on Restructuring and Evaluating Limited English Proficient Programs**

**Presenter**  Marco A Munoz, Jefferson County Public Schools  
**Abstract**  The Limited English Proficient (LEP) children are the fastest growing population in the high-poverty urban school district that served as the research site. The high-stakes testing environment is having an impact on how the existing LEP program is restructured. In the context of a high-stake testing environment, program evaluation emphasis has been given to various LEP dimensions, including (a) organizational structure, (b) database management operations, (c) English language proficiency assessment, (d) instructional alignment with statewide core content for assessment, (e) professional development activities, (f) involvement of academically at-risk LEP students with safety net programs, and (g) alignment of LEP proficiency measures with statewide assessment. Program evaluation findings have provided information to key stakeholders for (a) improvement of programs and activities, (b) to determine effectiveness, and (c) in determining whether or not to continue funding for specific programs and activities. Implications for evaluation theory, practice, and policy-making are discussed.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**Innovations in Collaborative Environmental Projects**  
MultiPaper Session 302 to be held in Ballroom B  
Sponsored by the Environmental Program Evaluation TIG  
**Chair**  Katherine A Dawes, US Environmental Protection Agency  
**Abstract**  This paper evaluates an on-line public dialogue held by the Environmental Protection Agency in July 2001 on the agency’s draft public participation policy. The dialogue involved over 1,100 people around the country and was unique for combining broad participation with the intensive interaction typically found only in small-group, face-to-face participation processes. Rooted in the broader literature on evaluating public involvement, the paper examines what is gained or lost by moving public participation on-line. It describes the dynamics of participation, the quality of communication, the characteristics of those who participated, and what participants and EPA got out of the process.

**Evaluating the National Dialogue on Public Involvement in Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Decisions**

**Presenter**  Thomas C Beierle, Resources for the Future  
**Abstract**  This paper evaluates an on-line public dialogue held by the Environmental Protection Agency in July 2001 on the agency’s draft public participation policy. The dialogue involved over 1,100 people around the country and was unique for combining broad participation with the intensive interaction typically found only in small-group, face-to-face participation processes. Rooted in the broader literature on evaluating public involvement, the paper examines what is gained or lost by moving public participation on-line. It describes the dynamics of participation, the quality of communication, the characteristics of those who participated, and what participants and EPA got out of the process.

**An Evaluation of Five Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Community-based Environmental Protection Projects: Accomplishments and Lessons Learned**

**Presenters**  Gerald J Filbin, US Environmental Protection Agency  
Robert Black, Industrial Economics Corporation Inc  
**Abstract**  This evaluation examined five EPA community-based environmental protection (CBEP) projects (see: http://www.epa.gov/ecocommunity for more information on CBEP). The evaluation considered the advantages and disadvantages of the CBEP approach and how the Agency can tailor its participation to best support them. The projects were: San Miguel (CO) Watershed Initiative; North Charleston/Charleston (SC) CBEP; Eastward Hol(FL); York (PA) Community-Based Strategic Planning and Green Development; and St. Louis (MO) Abandoned Buildings Project. The evaluation suggests that the approach can enhance the success of environmental protection efforts, provided that the process is designed to organize input of key participants and delineate clear roles and responsibilities. The CBEP approach can also yield several indirect benefits including creation of new
partnerships and development of local capacity to address environmental issues independently. The evaluation suggests that EPA plays an important role through funding and through technical support and management of multi-disciplinary initiatives.

**Evaluating the Environmental Justice Collaborative Model**

**Presenters**
- Eric L Marsh, US Environmental Protection Agency
- Katherine A Dawes, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Abstract**
This paper presents findings from a report that examines the value of using a multi-stakeholder collaborative model to address environmental justice issues in six diverse communities. This model, promoted by the federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice, encourages community groups, businesses, industry, academia and government agencies at all levels to work together to form and implement holistic solutions to complex, overlapping, issues of race, class, jobs, crime, health and the environment. The report seeks to understand the overall value of multi-stakeholder collaborative approaches, the value of federal agencies' involvement in these approaches, and key factors contributing to successes and challenges across the case study communities. The findings are intended to inform the Interagency Working Group, other agencies, and organizations on ways to best initiate, sponsor, advise, and/or participate in multi-stakeholder collaborative approaches to address local environmental justice issues in the future.

**Emergent and Competing Qualitative Approaches to Evaluating Systemic Processes that Reform Systems**

**Expert Lecture Session 303 to be held in Ballroom C**
**Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG**

**Speaker**
Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University

**Abstract**
Many evaluators and evaluation users think of qualitative methods and naturalistic inquiry monolithically in contrast to quantitative and experimental methods. However, a great diversity of perspectives and approaches exist within qualitative methods. These competing ways of engaging in qualitative evaluation have significant implications for evaluating systemic processes that reform systems. In particular, varying qualitative approaches differ in how they conceptualize, engage with, study, and report on holistic systems.

**Cross-Discipline Strategies to Meet Evaluation Challenges**

**Panel Session 304 to be held in Ballroom D**
**Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG**

**Chair**
Donna M Heivilin, US General Accounting Office

**Discussants**
- Donald G Fulwider, US General Accounting Office
- Valerie J Caracelli, US General Accounting Office

**Session Abstract**
In recent years a number of new and potentially beneficial strategies have been developed at a number of multidisciplinary organizations. These cross-discipline strategies combine or coordinate efforts across different disciplines or approaches. They can also be used in structurally different organizational contexts. The papers focus on modes of inquiry used for accountability purposes, primarily, audits, evaluations, and investigations. Each paper demonstrates how the utility and quality of information provided to decisionmakers was enhanced by the interface of these approaches. Studies resulted in more complete, accurate, and useful information. The first paper discusses five cross-discipline strategies and their information benefits. The second paper notes the necessity of multiple perspectives in high profile studies and the complementary institutional arrangement that can facilitate integration. The third presentation demonstrates successful cross-disciplinary work achieved through cooperation across units. The last presentation discusses how forensic audit techniques can be used in an inquiry to strengthen conclusions.

**Cross-discipline Strategies: Benefits Illustrated for Audit, Evaluation, and Investigation**

**Presenters**
- Judith A Droitcour, US General Accounting Office
- Valerie J Caracelli, US General Accounting Office
- Eric Larson, US General Accounting Office

**Abstract**
This paper discusses cross-discipline strategies and illustrates their information benefits. Examples from practice focus on the interface among audit, evaluation and investigations drawn from studies conducted by the U.S. General Accounting Office and other government organizations. Five cross-discipline strategies are illustrated: (1) meta studies (a study that examines another study of a contrasting type), (2) combining independent results of studies of different type, e.g., in a synthesis; (3) integrated products through teams with specialized knowledge or through an existing cross-discipline team; (4) sequential products where a report produced from one genre of studies (e.g., an investigation), triggers a subsequent report from another genre of
studies (an audit or an evaluation), and (5) concurrent “twin” studies, such as, coordinated work conducted by different offices or teams resulting in separate products. Study exemplars of these strategies will be discussed and the particular information benefits that increase utility for decision-making will be described.

**A Special Office for Integrated Cross-discipline Work**
Presenter: Glenn A Fine, US Department of Justice

Abstract: The Office of the Inspector General at the Department of Justice has created a special office for integrated cross-discipline work. The work of investigative attorneys, investigators, evaluators and others is combined in the Office of Oversight and Review. This special office was formed to better study high-profile complex issues that require more than a single perspective. The presentation will include examples of cross-discipline work, such as the Resendez-Ramirez case, which required (1) an investigation of the facts leading to INS failure to detain this known criminal at the border and (2) an evaluation of relevant INS procedures, pointing the way to needed improvements. This combination of approaches yielded a comprehensive and useful report that addressed the varied aspects of the problem under review.

**Phasing and Coordinating Audit, Evaluation, and Investigation for Maximum Utility**
Presenter: George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services

Abstract: The presentation illustrates ways for evaluators, auditors, and investigators to enhance the effectiveness of their offices, resulting in stronger work products. The discussion includes an example from Operation Restore Trust which was a multi-disciplinary approach to reduce fraud, waste and abuse in Medicare while protecting beneficiaries and improving the quality of services. Home health and nursing homes issues will serve as illustrations of the success of this project. The phased work began with OIGÆs Office of Investigations and highlighted the problem of fraud in home health agencies. This investigatory work led to a second phase of work and two planned and coordinated “twin” studies (1) an audit to estimate the size of the governmentÆs financial losses and (2) an evaluation to identify problem sources and recommend fixes. These twin reports, issued on the same day, provided a comprehensive account of the nature, extensiveness, and causes of fraud and possible solutions.

**Forensic Audit Techniques Used in the General Accounting Office’s Audits of Government Credit Cards**
Presenters: Gregory D Kutz, US General Accounting Office  
Daniel R Blair, US General Accounting Office

Abstract: The federal government has increased the use of purchase cards from about $2 billion in fiscal year 1995 to nearly $14 billion in fiscal year 2001. The Department of Defense (DOD) increased purchase card use to eliminate the bureaucracy and paperwork small purchases require. However, controls must be in place to ensure proper use. GAO reported (GAO-01-995T, GAO-02-32) a significant breakdown in internal controls at two Navy units contributed to fraudulent and abusive usage of purchase cards, and theft and misuse of government property. GAO reported similar findings relating to the Department of Education (GAO-01-997T, GAO-01-1151). The reports used investigative techniques, including statistical sampling and targeted data mining using specialized software. GAO’s Office of Special Investigations (OSI) referred potential criminal activity to our Office of Special Investigations. These approaches will be used in current work on purchase and travel card usage so that recommendations can be made to strengthen internal controls where warranted.

**Evaluation Project Management: A Key to Effective Evaluation**
Skill-building Workshop Session 305 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG

Chair: Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University

Presenters: Frances Lawrenz, University of Minnesota  
Nanette M Keiser, Western Michigan University

Session Abstract: As programs become increasingly complex, so must our evaluations of these programs, requiring sophisticated and systematic management skills to ensure effective evaluations. The goal of this session is to provide participants with basic knowledge, skills, tools (e.g., checklists), and other resources for evaluation project management. The session will use a mix of a PowerPoint presentation, demonstration, and small group work to enhance interest in the topic and learning through application. Brief demonstrations of key features of software packages for evaluation project management will be interwoven throughout the session. Evaluation project management issues will be discussed. A hands-on exercise in which participants will apply basic evaluation project management principles to various examples (Web-based survey, site visits) will follow. After additional examples are reviewed, the participants will be asked to form groups and work on various scenarios to apply the principles reviewed.

**High Stakes Testing: Does It Reform School Systems to the Benefit of All Children?**
Presentation Title

Presenter

Abstract

---

Policy, Context and the Use of Evaluation Theory

MultiPaper Session 307 to be held in the Washington A room

Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG

Systemic Implications of Evaluation

Presenter

Abstract

---

Beyond Direct Service Evaluation: Categories of Social Interventions and Implications for Evaluation Theory and Practice

Presenters

Abstract

---

Evaluation 2002: Thursday, November 7, 8:00 am to 9:30 am
common categories include goods, services, information, economic incentives, and regulation. In this paper, we first lay out a model of types of social interventions, including those sponsored by foundations and NGOs, and including in an interactive fashion the targeted audiences. With this framework we make several points, including: (1) AEA-type evaluators generally ignore major categories of social change approaches; (2) different evaluation approaches might fit better with different of these change approaches; and (3) program theories are often hierarchically organized within categories of social change tools. More generally, we argue that evaluation theory needs to draw more broadly from policy analysis and the social and behavioral sciences.

**Exploring the “C” in the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Model: The Role of Context in Evaluation**

**Presenter**  
Tanya M Suarez, Suarez & Associates

**Abstract**  
This paper explores the role of context in evaluation by examining its place in evaluation literature with an emphasis on the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model. It is further explored with illustrations of the influence of context on seven low-wealth school districts that developed state-of-the-art multimedia suites called Cyber Campuses. Factors such as leadership, support for the Cyber Campuses, “community agency”, demographics, characteristics of staff, and focus for the technology are explored for their influence on the success or failure of the Cyber Campuses. The results are then analyzed in relation to the evaluation concepts regarding context found in the literature.

---

**International Implications for Evaluator Certification**

Panel Session 308 to be held in the Washington B room  
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Craig Russon, WK Kellogg Foundation

**Discussant**  
Arnold Love, Independent Consultant

**Presenters**  
James W Altschuld, The Ohio State University  
Alexey Kuzmin, Process Consulting Company  
Gwen Keith, Catholic Education Centre  
Masafumi Nagao, Hiroshima University

**Session Abstract**  
Russon recently submitted a manuscript to AJE for possible publication entitled “A Conditional Case for Certification of Evaluators.” Panelists will be asked to read and prepare a response to the article. Afterwards, the audience will be invited to participate in the discussion.

---

**Evaluating a Middle Grades Comprehensive School Reform Model: Multiple Perspectives and Voices**

Panel Session 309 to be held in the Potomac I room  
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Sharon A Ramsden, WestEd

**Discussant**  
Roger JD Chesswas, WestEd

**Session Abstract**  
This panel will present the results of the first year of a longitudinal study of the pilot implementation of a middle grades comprehensive reform model. The evaluation employs a mixed methodologies and methods approach. In this session we will look at the first year of implementation from a variety of perspectives: teachers, principals, students, and classrooms. At the end of the session we will bring these perspectives together to identify the conclusions we can draw from this first year of study. Throughout the panel presentations we will be making linkages between perspectives and voices and how these corroborate and build upon one another as a way to demonstrate how multiple methods deepen and broaden both descriptive and evaluative information. This will provide a springboard for attendees to critique our evaluation approach.

**Middle Grades Reform: Perspectives from The Classroom**

**Presenter**  
Nada Rayyes, WestEd

**Abstract**  
At the center of the middle grades reform model is transforming classroom practice. The classroom is the critical place where teaching and learning occur, and where the results of the efforts of the model's many components: professional development, curriculum planning, instructional strategies, school structures, management, shared leadership can be seen. This presentation will address the classroom observation portion of our evaluation of the reform model. We will discuss the methodology of our classroom observations, including the development, redevelopment, and testing of the observation tool, as well as our findings thus far. Our results are based on systematic, non-participant observations by a pair of evaluators at each school site. Although it is only the first year of implementation, we have already seen some changes in classroom practices, including the physical environment, seating and grouping arrangements, and new instructional strategies being explored.

**Middle Grades Reform: Perspectives of Principals**
Evaluating Integrated Services Programs: The Starting Early Starting Smart Multi-site Evaluation

Panel Session 310 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair J Fred Springer, EMT Associates Inc
Discussant J Fred Springer, EMT Associates Inc
Session Abstract Starting Early Starting Smart (S.E.S.S.) is a large-scale multi-site study set up to evaluate the differential efficacy of programs designed to integrate behavioral health services such as substance abuse and mental health in existing health care systems as an effort to improve access to and utilization of health care services by high-risk children and their caregiver, which eventually will improve their health behaviors. This presentation will demonstrate the importance of different strategies and approaches adopted in the evaluation process. In the S.E.S.S. study, the evaluation progressed by focusing on three distinct integrated assessments: assessment of services access, utilization, and barriers and their relation to family and child outcomes, assessment of family and child outcomes, assessment of family and child outcomes, and videotaping assessment of child parent interaction in integrated programs.

Assessing Service Access and Utilization in Integrated Services Programs

Presenter Elizabeth Sale, EMT Associates Inc
Abstract Generically, there is a direct relationship between treatment implementation and treatment effectiveness. Thus, assessing treatment effectiveness requires assessing the extent of treatment implementation to the targeted population. Assessing the deferential efficacy of integrated services programs requires assessing the access and utilization of such services (treatment implementation) by the intended population. This presentation will demonstrate the strategies and the steps to evaluate the implementation of integrated services programs through the assessment of service access and utilization by the intended population and the dynamics and the characteristics of that population that could influence and sometimes hinder the access and utilization of such services. The S.E.S.S. study provides a great example on evaluating the implementation of integrated services over time, in a multi sites setting, through the dynamic changes in the population. It provides evidence on the importance of monitoring such activities over time and how it relates to the evaluation of the integrated services programs effectiveness.

Multivariate Longitudinal Modeling on the Starting Early, Starting Smart Cross-site Evaluation

Presenter Alberto Heredia, WestEd
Abstract The principal plays the most pivotal role in any whole school reform effort. An important part of our evaluation of the reform model is our regular contact with the principals. We conduct semi-structured interviews with the principals once a year in addition to many informal conversations. We also have been observing the principals' participation in professional development, on-site coaching, and other meetings and interactions with teachers. Ultimately we derive our data of the principals' perspectives from the interviews. In addition, we collect information through teachers, coaches and on-site facilitators interviews about the principal's role as an instructional leader. Thus far, we've found that an overwhelming majority of the principals are committed to the model, and several are taking steps to truly reform their schools (including making structural changes, such as block scheduling, and facilitating more time for teachers to collaborate and receive useful professional development.

Middle Grades Reform: The Student Voice

Presenter Sheila Shea, WestEd
Abstract An important perspective and voice in our evaluation comes from the students themselves. Not only will we describe and evaluate the kinds of learning in which students engage, and the instruction they receive, but we will also report on how they describe and assess their own experiences in being an important participant in an educational reform initiative. Rarely do we hear the student voice in educational evaluation and the focus groups we held with students in the 15 pilot schools provide us with important insights about students' experiences in, and perspectives and feelings about being part of, a new set of teaching and learning approaches. Our questions with students focused on their knowledge of the reform model, the kinds of new teaching and learning experiences they were having in their classrooms, what they think about their own learning and performance, and their assessments of the whole experience.

Middle Grades Reform: Perspectives of Teachers

Presenter Oscar Cerna, WestEd
Abstract When evaluating comprehensive school reform initiatives it is important to investigate the perspective of the teachers involved. Teachers deliver the information to the students and are a vital part of any comprehensive school reform model. This presentation will discuss the results of teacher surveys and focus groups conducted across the nation as part of the evaluation of the Different Ways of Knowing for the Middle Grades, a reform model in development by the Galef Institute. Areas to be presented include lesson design and planning, collaboration, teacher buy-in, student learning and assessment, professional development and the learning environment.
Multi-site Studies: Innovative Analytic Strategies
Panel Session 312 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair Debra J Rog, Vanderbilt University
Discussant Debra J Rog, Vanderbilt University
Session Abstract Multi-site studies have a number of advantages, such as the potential of producing more generalizable results than single individual studies. They also have a host of methodological and analytical challenges. This panel addresses the analytic challenges that stem from multi-site studies,

Videotaping and Its Use in Capturing Key Outcome Measures That Reflect Child Parent Interactions
Presenter Elizabeth E Harris, EMT Associates Inc
Abstract A central goal of the Starting Early, Starting Smart initiative was to impact the family and home environment of very young children in need in a positive way, in order to treat and prevent the effects of behavioral health problems right from the start. Current knowledge of child development argued that the role of the parent-child interaction in fostering positive socio-emotional development of young children is absolutely critical. However, meaningful measurement of the cognitive and emotional functioning of infants and toddlers is a difficult endeavor since child verbal skills are not yet developed and young child problem behaviors are sometimes indistinguishable from normal behaviors if observed in isolation. The Starting Early, Starting Smart initiative broke new ground by utilizing valid, reliable, observational tools to evaluate program impact on quality of familiesÆ parent-child interaction. Each of the 5 primary care S.E.S.S programs (which focused on families in need with infants and toddlers) collected systematic videotaped interactions between S.E.S.S program parent-infant dyads, and comparison program parent-infant dyads. These were coded reliably according to NCAST and NICHD scoring protocols. Early findings show positive treatment-comparison differences after 12 months of participation in S.E.S.S versus comparison programs. This analysis will be repeated on incoming data from an 18-month follow up videotape data collection. The 18-month results will be included in the presentation as well. The early findings suggest that the S.E.S.S integrated behavioral health initiatives positively impacted parent-child bonding, arguably the most influential sphere of child development.

Building a Culture of Electronic Evaluation: Contexts and Strategies
Think Tank Session 311 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG
Facilitator Susan A Tucker, Evaluation & Development Associates
Talbot Bielefeldt, International Society for Technology in Education
Session Abstract While US federal funding agencies stipulate evaluation, a review of the literature reviews a dearth of studies exploring the role that context plays in embedding culturally sensitive evaluation tools. Why do so many technology projects avoid integrating electronic tools into the evaluation process of instructional technology projects? The authors have found these federal programs are well positioned to explore the role of systemic contexts in framing evaluation questions, informing the selection of evaluation methods, directing evaluation efforts, and using evaluation findings. This session is designed to share electronic evaluation tools regarding 12 current technology projects that have been funded by five USDE federal agencies (PT3, FIPSE, NSF, Goals 2000 and Challenge Grants). Five issues will focus the discussion: 1. what electronic tools are used by these projects, both successfully and less so? 2. how can these electronic tools be leveraged for diverse users and usage such as integration into an institution’s unit assessment system which is consistent with NCATE and ISTE guidelines? 3. how are these electronic evaluation strategies integrated into divergent contexts? 4. what have been barriers to their successful application? And 5. what are ideas for future electronic evaluation tool development and research?
especially from those that are longitudinal and incorporate one or more quasi-experimental individual site designs with a small number of cases. Presentations of approaches to handle these challenges will include multi-level modeling (HLM), structural equation modeling (SEM), and meta-analysis, as well as approaches for computing propensity scores to correct possible biases due to quasi-experimental design in a multi-site study. The presentations will be based on data from two national multi-site studies, the CMHS Housing Initiative and the CMHS/CSAT Homeless Families program, to illustrate the approaches.

**Changes in Time and Space: Methods for Analyzing Longitudinal Data in Multi-Site Studies**

**Presenter**  
Warren Lambert, Vanderbilt University

**Abstract**  
The benefits of conducting multi-site evaluation studies are well known, as are the benefits of collecting longitudinal data. The analysis of longitudinal data in a multi-site study can be very complicated, however, due to variations in study designs, the use of different comparison groups or the lack of non-treatment cohorts as well as differences in target populations served. This presentation will discuss the use of various analytic approaches in multi-site, longitudinal studies, including hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), structural equation modeling (SEM), and meta-analysis. The experiences from two national multi-site studies, the CMHS Housing Initiative and the CMHS/CSAP Homeless Families Program, will be presented to illustrate some common challenges as well as new approaches to address these issues.

**Propensity Correction in Multi-site Quasi-experimental Studies: Lessons Learned from the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) Housing Initiative and the CMHS/Centers for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT)**

**Presenters**  
Anja K Kurki, Vanderbilt University  
C Scott Holupka, Vanderbilt University  
Debra J Rog, Vanderbilt University

**Abstract**  
In studies in which subjects have not been randomly assigned, initial differences between treatment and control groups may exist, biasing estimates of treatment effects. Propensity scores offer a way to untangle the confounds between study participant characteristics and the effects of the program under study. This paper presents different approaches of developing and evaluating propensity scores for multi-site studies. Results from two national studies, the CMHS Housing Initiative for Persons with Serious Mental Illness and the CMHS/CSAT Homeless Families Program are used to illustrate the challenges in computing propensity scores with varying sites, such as site-specific differences in population characteristics and participant selection processes. The paper concludes with practical guidelines for computing and evaluating propensity scores for multi-site initiatives.

**Housing Initiative Outcomes: An Application of Structural Equations Modeling**

**Presenters**  
Michelle Stewart, University of Arizona  
Hsiu-Ju Lin, Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services  
Linda Frisman, Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services

**Abstract**  
Many of the programs studied by evaluators involve mediated causal effects. Structural equations modeling (SEM) with latent variables offers an opportunity to model factors that are hypothesized to mediate the effect of an intervention on the outcome variable; once such causal models have been formulated, researchers can evaluate the fit of these models to the data. Latent variable modeling also allows the estimation and removal of random and correlated measurement error. Thus, latent variable SEM should provide more accurate estimates of the effects of intervention program than more traditional approaches. Using a quasi-experimental longitudinal study of supported housing as an example, these two presentations presents the rationale and theory for such analyses, and the results by using two site-specific examples. Emphasis is on the application of SEM to furthering our understanding of outcomes.

**Collaborative Evaluation of Los Angeles County’s First Five Childcare Initiatives**

Panel Session 313 to be held in the Potomac V room

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Rita O’Sullivan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Discussant**  
Will Nicholas, Los Angeles County Proposition 10 Commission

**Session Abstract**  
Evaluation, Assessment, and Policy Connections (EvAP) will share evaluation techniques that are part of its on-going evaluation of the Los Angeles County Children and Families First (Prop 10) Commission’s childcare initiatives. The panel will consist of members of EvAP as well as Prop 10 staff. The evaluation team will focus on the methodology involved in this evaluation: * Using a collaborative approach in designing evaluations and policy analysis * Using Atlas-ti software to analyze qualitative data * Using ArcView software to map human services information * Using Evaluation Conferences to build evaluation capacity Members of the Prop 10 Commission will present a client’s perspective on: * benefits of collaborative evaluation in increasing organizational evaluation capacity, * improving the quality of evaluation evidence, * providing for greater leveraging of resources. The panel will conclude with a discussion of the application of evaluation results and the benefits of using a collaborative approach.

**Evaluation Design: Los Angeles County’s First Five Childcare Initiative**

---

**Collaborative Evaluation of Los Angeles County’s First Five Childcare Initiatives**

Panel Session 313 to be held in the Potomac V room

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Rita O’Sullivan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Discussant**  
Will Nicholas, Los Angeles County Proposition 10 Commission

**Session Abstract**  
Evaluation, Assessment, and Policy Connections (EvAP) will share evaluation techniques that are part of its on-going evaluation of the Los Angeles County Children and Families First (Prop 10) Commission’s childcare initiatives. The panel will consist of members of EvAP as well as Prop 10 staff. The evaluation team will focus on the methodology involved in this evaluation: * Using a collaborative approach in designing evaluations and policy analysis * Using Atlas-ti software to analyze qualitative data * Using ArcView software to map human services information * Using Evaluation Conferences to build evaluation capacity Members of the Prop 10 Commission will present a client’s perspective on: * benefits of collaborative evaluation in increasing organizational evaluation capacity, * improving the quality of evaluation evidence, * providing for greater leveraging of resources. The panel will conclude with a discussion of the application of evaluation results and the benefits of using a collaborative approach.

**Evaluation Design: Los Angeles County’s First Five Childcare Initiative**
Evaluation 2002: Thursday, November 7, 8:00 am to 9:30 am

**Presenter**
Rita O'Sullivan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Abstract**
Dr. O'Sullivan will discuss the overarching framework of this evaluation and how a collaborative approach lends itself to sustainable systems reform.

**Evaluation Implementation: Los Angeles County's First Five Childcare Initiative**

**Presenters**
Anne D'Agostino, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Bethany Page, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Abstract**
Dr. D'Agostino and Ms. Page will discuss the details of the evaluation design. The integration of EvAP's mission with the Commission's evaluation needs, the scope of work, and evaluation techniques will be included in their presentation.

**Evaluation Results Analysis: Los Angeles County's First Five Childcare Initiatives**

**Presenters**
Amy Anderson, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Paul Masina, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Abstract**
Dr. D'Agostino and Ms. Page will discuss the details of the evaluation design. The integration of EvAP's mission with the Commission's evaluation needs, the scope of work, and evaluation techniques will be included in their presentation.

**Incorporation of Results: Los Angeles County's First Five Childcare Initiative**

**Presenters**
Amy A. Germuth, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Sarah E. Heinemeier, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Abstract**
Ms. Germuth and Ms. Heinemeier will review the techniques used to analyze both qualitative and quantitative data. The use of Atlas ti and ArcView software packages will be included.

---

**Evaluation of the Social Programs and Projects in Uzbekistan: Lessons and Outcomes**

Panel Session 314 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG

**Chair**
Shakhruh Mahkamdjanov, Counterpart Consortium

**Discussant**
Shakhruh Mahkamdjanov, Counterpart Consortium

**Session Abstract**
The propose session would allow to present the progressive tools are being more effectively implemented into the evaluation of the social projects under the technical assistance programs through different multinational organizations. This would really should the positive and negative experience of the more than year experience in conducting the evaluation of programs and projects with different type and content. Moreover, the proposed session would allow to generate the wide discussions between professionals over status of implication of the evaluation methodology in developing countries in Central Asian regions and even in East Europe. At the same time the session could also rais a dialogue on the main obstacles which may appear on the way of the evaluators and surely provide proven mechanisms of adapting the evaluation methods to the specificity of the region. The session of presentation consists of three parts. Main part is devoted to the main program activity of Counterpart in Uzbekistan, the other part devoted to experience of the Counterpart's local staff experts in evaluation. And the last part covers the main outcomes (conclusions from such activity).

**Presenter**
Shakhruh Mahkamdjanov, Counterpart Consortium

**Speciality of the Evaluation of the Health Projects in Ferghana Valley**

**Presenter**
Shukhrat Aripov, Counterpart Consortium

---

**Building Toward System Change Using a Research and Development Model**

Demonstration Session 315 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG

**Chair**
Lena Klumper, The Partnership for Children of Cumberland County

**Presenters**
Lena Klumper, The Partnership for Children of Cumberland County
Tina Newcomb, The Partnership for Children of Cumberland County

**Session Abstract**
System change is revising the way people and institutions think, behave and use resources to affect, fundamentally, the type, quality and degree of service delivery. This presentation will describe how our research and development department serves as a foundation for system change in our community. Building blocks we use to facilitate system change include: utilizing research and evaluation data (local, community and national) to develop and enhance programs through the provision of community workgroups, building capacity through individual and group technical assistance, creating and
streamlining shared data management systems, cultivating public awareness techniques and resources, enhancing fund development/resource allocation and building in feedback loops for quality improvement. Our research and development model encompasses assessing current community realities, defining gaps and barriers in service provision, and the usage of evaluation information to strategize around solutions the community can embrace. We will discuss our model and include lessons learned with strategies that have achieved results.

**Roundtables: Health & Human Services I**

**Note:** These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 8:45 am.

Roundtables Session 316 to be held in the Tidewater room

**First Rotation – Table A: Evaluation of School-based Family Support Service Programs: A Tale of Two Cities**

**Presenter** Mieko K Smith, Cleveland State University

**Abstract** This paper will present evaluation of school-based family support service programs implemented by two school districts for which the presenter was an evaluation consultant. One school district successfully developed a program logic model and collected data through the program implementation. At the end of the school year, the program director provided data on program outputs and outcomes based on the data collected by the program staff. Another district failed to develop outcome measures and to reach consensus on the program logic model. The paper will discuss key issues that separated these two districts, including the district's commitment to evaluation, the level of participation in evaluation by the staff, and the nature of partnership with the evaluator. The presentation will consider theoretical and operational issues critical for the successful implementation of evaluation.

**First Rotation – Table B: New York Works: A System Change Initiative of the Social Security Administration**

**Presenters** Nawaf Madi, New York WORKS
Valerie Melburg, New York WORKS

**Abstract** New York WORKS, a systems change initiative focusing on increasing the employment rate of persons with disabilities, implemented and tested SSI and HUD work incentives coupled with specialized services using an experimental design. In a consensus building process key stakeholders identified and designed the system interventions that would promote the coordination of services and policies across different agencies and organizations. System change accomplished by the efforts of New York WORKS lead to a number of policy, legislative and system gap reforms statewide and nationally. New York WORKS preliminary findings on the effectiveness of systems change and coordination on the employment rate of project participants will be presented.

**First Rotation – Table C: Street Outreach: An Evaluation Challenge**

**Presenters** Saul M Levin, Access Consulting International Inc
Melissa A Davey, Johns Hopkins University

**Abstract** Project Orion, a medical mobile unit, is a partnership between government and the community. This unit provides primary medical care, HIV/STD screenings, as well as prevention/education. Individuals are invited to use the unit's services by community outreach in sections of the District of Columbia where there is a high incidence/prevalence of substance abuse and crime. This intervention conducts door-to-door canvassing, street corner outreach, appearances at community health fairs, effective case management, use of incentives for client follow-up, and establishes linkages with medical as well as social service agencies. Project Orion touches the lives of "hard-core, hard to reach addicts". Moreover, because of the increased incidence of drug use among seniors, Project Orion has endeavored to collaborate with elder programs to conduct prevention/education. This paper will elaborate on several innovative strategies for outreach to special populations, including an evaluation design for assessing the program's efficacy.

**First Rotation – Table D: Systemic Reforms Through Community Mobilization, Capacity Building and Social Change: Lessons Learned from a Teen Pregnancy Prevention Demonstration Project**

**Presenter** Yolanda G Martinez, Orange County Health Department

**Abstract** The U.S. has the highest adolescent birth rate of any of the industrialized nations. In 1995, recognizing the serious health and psychological consequences of adolescent pregnancy, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) funded 13 national demonstration sites to develop, community-driven, teen pregnancy prevention models grounded in (1) community mobilization, (2) social change and (3) capacity building. This paper will discuss process and outcome evaluation data from one of the thirteen sites: the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Coalition (TPPC) in Orlando, FL. The discussion will center on the barriers and enablers encountered in community capacity-building efforts, particularly in the identification and implementation of youth development programs and evaluation capacity and resources among local agencies. The paper also focuses on the systemic impact and changes that have resulted from the work of the coalition in programs that directly impact the health of adolescents particularly those who engage in risky sexual behaviors.
Abstract  When the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) legislation was implemented, there were widely divergent hypotheses about how poor families would be affected. On the one hand, supporters of welfare reform expected that time limits and work requirements would promote employment and thereby improve the financial situation of these families. On the other hand, critics predicted devastating effects on families, including increased poverty, more homelessness and housing problems, greater food insecurity and hunger, and loss of health insurance and health care access. This paper provides an in-depth analysis of how welfare reform was implemented in one community – Cleveland, Ohio – and uses data from a longitudinal survey and ethnography to study changes in employment experiences and life circumstances among single mothers living in low-income neighborhoods.

First Rotation – Table E: How Are Poor Families Faring Under Welfare Reform? Findings from a Longitudinal Evaluation in Cleveland, Ohio

Presenters: Thomas Brock, Manpower Demonstration Research Corp
Claudia Coulton, Case Western Reserve University
Lashawn Richburg-Hayes, Manpower Demonstration Research Corp
Andrew London, Kent State University
Denise Polit, Humanalysis Inc
Ellen Scott, University of Oregon
Nandita Verma, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

Abstract  This paper focuses upon the rising incidence of adolescent drug use in America. Through a combination of various factors, ranging from pre-dispositional to enabling and confounding, this research uses a multi-factorial approach which systematically addresses an intervention using preventative strategies for potential adolescent drug users. Statistics will be addressed as well as the utilization of a theoretical framework using the systems theory. This theory encompasses a multitude of varied facets that direct, coordinate, and organize research and evaluation activities that often accompany human behavior and social dynamics of prevention strategies. Within the societal context, the role of assessing and evaluating drug use among adolescents, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors are of utmost importance in terms of perception, acceptance, and implementation of various interventions designed to be culturally relevant as well as curtail at-risk behaviors for drug use. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to systematically develop an evaluation protocol in the assessment of an intervention targeting adolescents.

First Rotation – Table F: The Shared Reading Project: Program Evaluation from Theory to Practice

Presenters: Linda L Delk, Gallaudet University
Lori J Lutz, Gallaudet University

Abstract  The Shared Reading Project (SRP), nationally disseminated by the Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center at Gallaudet University, is a home-based tutoring program for parents learning to share books visually with their deaf young children. Tutors serve as bilingual reading models (American Sign Language and English) for participating families. Internal program evaluation supports (1) program development, (2) organizational learning about implementation processes and short-term outcomes for families of traditionally underserved groups of deaf and hard of hearing children; (3) development of a training program for wider project dissemination; (4) monitoring of project diffusion for accountability; and (5) evaluation of longer term outcomes for participating children. Each phase of this evaluation, shaped by collaborations with major stakeholders, focuses on providing information that feeds into project expansion and improvement processes.

Second Rotation – Table A: Evaluating the Systematic Process of an Intervention Designed to Prevent Drug Use among Adolescents

Presenter: Jimmy L Boyd, Research Services Unlimited

Abstract  This paper focuses upon the rising incidence of adolescent drug use in America. Through a combination of various factors, ranging from pre-dispositional to enabling and confounding, this research uses a multi-factorial approach which systematically addresses an intervention using preventative strategies for potential adolescent drug users. Statistics will be addressed as well as the utilization of a theoretical framework using the systems theory. This theory encompasses a multitude of varied facets that direct, coordinate, and organize research and evaluation activities that often accompany human behavior and social dynamics of prevention strategies. Within the societal context, the role of assessing and evaluating drug use among adolescents, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors are of utmost importance in terms of perception, acceptance, and implementation of various interventions designed to be culturally relevant as well as curtail at-risk behaviors for drug use. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to systematically develop an evaluation protocol in the assessment of an intervention targeting adolescents.

Second Rotation – Table B: Evaluating Financial and Social Assets of Women in Recovery: Investment Club as an Empowerment Group

Presenter: Frank A Sansone, Indiana University Northwest

Abstract  An investment club was implemented based on assets development theory to increase the financial and social assets of women in recovery from substance abuse in an aftercare program. Expected outcomes were perceived improvements in social support, investment knowledge/skills, financial assets, and contributions to maintenance of recovery. An extended focus group approach was used to evaluate the club's contributions employing the administration of a questionnaire prior to the focus group session. An increased disparity in wealth between the rich and poor and a decline in personal savings (Diaz-Gimenez, Quadirri, & Rios-Rull, 1997) and social capital (Putnam, 1995) have led to an emphasis on financial literacy, investment education, and civic involvement. Low income families despite working hard are often unable to work their way out of poverty because they cannot build wealth (Sherraden, 1990) and do not have access to financial services and investment education (Stoesz and Saunders, 1998). The intervention follows the Settlement House tradition (Alexander, 1987) of providing education and activities through clubs.

Second Rotation – Table C: Evaluation of a Volunteer Provided Mental Health Therapy Program for the Medically Underserved

Abstract  This paper focuses upon the rising incidence of adolescent drug use in America. Through a combination of various factors, ranging from pre-dispositional to enabling and confounding, this research uses a multi-factorial approach which systematically addresses an intervention using preventative strategies for potential adolescent drug users. Statistics will be addressed as well as the utilization of a theoretical framework using the systems theory. This theory encompasses a multitude of varied facets that direct, coordinate, and organize research and evaluation activities that often accompany human behavior and social dynamics of prevention strategies. Within the societal context, the role of assessing and evaluating drug use among adolescents, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors are of utmost importance in terms of perception, acceptance, and implementation of various interventions designed to be culturally relevant as well as curtail at-risk behaviors for drug use. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to systematically develop an evaluation protocol in the assessment of an intervention targeting adolescents.
The Poudre Health Services District of Larimer County, Colorado coordinates a volunteer mental health therapy program that matches low-income and uninsured clients in need of mental health services with therapists in the community who voluntarily provide reduced cost therapy sessions. Since 1998, a multi-stage evaluation plan has tracked program process measures and several separate indicators that corroborate improved mental health outcomes among participants. Evaluation findings and periodic surveys of client and provider satisfaction have been used to inform programmatic changes that led to increased efficiencies, more effective use of limited resources, and expanded mental health care services to better meet the needs of the clients and the providers who contribute their time and skills. In this session, evaluation tools, methods, challenges and examples of key findings and how they shaped programmatic change will be demonstrated as a potential model for other community-based volunteer programs.

**Second Rotation** – Table D: Defining Recidivism in Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare

| Presenters | Crysta L Parkin, Olmsted County Community Services  
|           | Marian R Heinrichs, Olmsted County |

**Abstract**

Recidivism is a key indicator in many areas of evaluation and is often a critical piece of mandated reporting to local, state and national agencies. Unfortunately for those of us who have to pull together this data, recidivism is rarely defined concretely and we have to guess at what the requesting party considers recidivism to be. The lack of concrete definitions for recidivism also makes it difficult to make comparison among agencies that have perhaps calculated recidivism differently. This roundtable will discuss how two programs in Olmsted County (juvenile corrections and child protection) have defined recidivism, present examples of the data gathered according to those definitions, and generate discussion about other ways to define recidivism.

**Second Rotation** – Table F: Early Findings from the Safe Schools/Healthy Students National Evaluation

| Presenters | Phillip W Graham, RTI International  
|           | Sonia Chessen, US Department of Health and Human Services  
|           | Ellen L Konrad, RMC Research Corporation  
|           | James Trudeau, RTI International  
|           | Stephen L Murray, RMC Research Corporation |

**Abstract**

In 1999, the federal government responded to an alarming wave of shootings and school violence incidents by launching the Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) Initiative that supports community-wide partnerships and provides funding for enhanced services to address school safety issues. The Initiative represents a major collaborative effort among three federal agencies (the Departments of Education, Justice, and Health and Human Services) to promote healthy school environments and healthy childhood development, and to prevent violence, substance use and mental health problems among children and youth. The agencies contracted with partners RTI International and RMC Research Corporation to conduct a multi-year national evaluation of the SS/HS Initiative. Through process and outcome studies, the national evaluation is documenting the effectiveness of local collaborative efforts to facilitate change within individuals, institutions, and community systems. This panel will present initial results from school-based and community partnership surveys, and case studies of selected sites.

**Using Innovative Methodology to Understand the Influence of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in Systemic Contexts**

Multipaper Session 317 to be held in the Kennedy room

**Sponsored by** the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

**Chair** James Earl Davis, Temple University

**The Use of the Delphi Technique to Increase Minority Participation in the Evaluation Process**

| Presenter | Eric Barela, University of California at Los Angeles |

**Abstract**

The Delphi technique is used to measure consensus within an organization without group interaction (Dalkey, 1967; Helmer, 1967).
large groups dominated by Whites, people of color often do not feel like they have a voice in the decision-making process. This method of evaluation allows for a representation of diverse interests based on experience and expertise, rather than position and status (Linstone and Turoff, 1975). UCLA has a mission to increase the number of traditionally underrepresented minority students who are eligible for the University of California. This technique was used to assess the perceived impact of UCLAÆs student-centered outreach activities on the six conditions necessary for school-centered systemic change.


Judging Christy: A Multimethod Approach for Studying Issues of Gender, Race and Ethnicity and Their Possible Influence in the Evaluation of Teaching at a Research University

Presenter: Edith J. Cisneros-Cohenour, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán

Abstract: This study focused on the validity of the evaluation of teaching at a research university. In the first part of the study, an instrumental case study of a female instructor of diverse ethnic ancestry was used for examining the validity of the evaluation for representing the quality of teaching at a departmental level. In the second part of the study, a sample of women and minority professors were selected to study issues of content, substantive and consequential validity. This part of the study focused on the meanings given to the construct “good teaching,” the processes followed by undergraduate students when rating their instructors, and how race, gender and ethnicity affected the evaluation ratings of a sample of women and minority professors on campus. Data were collected over a period of two years using multiple methods, including participant observation, in-depth and focus group interviews, document analysis, and survey research.

Using the Concerns Report Method to Identify Issues Affecting Employment Among African Americans with Disabilities

Presenter: Kimberly M. Hall, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract: Despite empirical and anecdotal evidence indicating that the majority of people with disabilities want to work, the unemployment rate among African Americans with disabilities is close to 80%. Within this group, there are those who actively seek, but are unable to obtain, employment. This presentation will demonstrate the use of the Concerns Report Method as a means of understanding the context in which this phenomenon occurs, identifying issues that are important to those who experience it, and generating ideas for improving conditions from the perspective of the participants. In addition to highlighting the key findings and the accompanying action agenda from this needs assessment, I will provide a brief overview of the Concerns Report Method, describe how I modified its traditional use for the present study, and highlight its potential use in the field as a culturally sensitive and participatory method that results in increased cultural competence among evaluators.

Evaluation at the Macro-level: Implications for Community and National Agendas

MultiPaper Session 318 to be held in the Jefferson room

Sponsored by the Social Work and the Human Services Evaluation TIG

The Effects of Psychological Factors to Employment: Findings That Inform Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) System Reform

Presenters: M. Sebrena Jackson, Clark Atlanta University

Ronnie Jackson, Clark Atlanta University

Abstract: This paper presentation describes an evaluation of a curriculum that was used to address psychological factors that negatively impact TANF recipients' ability to transition from welfare-to-work. Finally, the paper explores the issue of TANF reauthorization and the need for systemic reform to address the specific needs of those remaining on TANF caseloads.

African American Women and HIV Disease: A Response to System Reform

Presenter: Jenny L. Jones, University of Tennessee at Nashville

Abstract: This paper presentation examines the issues of disclosure and social supports faced by African American women infected with HIV disease. The paper begins with an overview of HIV disease, trends and changes in the disease, and the socio-cultural impact HIV disease has on women. Next, data on the process, outcome, and impact findings are presented. The paper explores the role of system reform in the context of the evaluation questions, the selection of evaluation methods, and ultimately the use of the evaluation findings in informing the project as well as the agenda of the consortium.

Assessing the Relative Impact of Demographic and Organizational Diversity on the Outcomes of Community Coalitions

Presenters: Donald R. Baker, University of Oklahoma

Kenneth R. Wedel, University of Oklahoma
Jeremy D Higgins, University of Oklahoma

Abstract Recent evaluations of substance abuse prevention coalitions suggest that the more diverse a coalition's membership, the better the outcomes for its members. One issue raised by these evaluations concerns the nature of diversity as a construct, usually defined with reference to the demographic characteristics of members. Data from an evaluation of twenty-five community prevention coalitions in Oklahoma are used to assess the relative contributions of demographic and organizational diversity to intermediate coalition outcomes. A demographic survey is used to derive an index of age, gender and ethnic diversity for each coalition. A content analysis of meeting attendance rosters over twelve months provides the measure of organizational diversity. Member surveys of perceived meeting effectiveness, satisfaction with coalition activities and participation comprise the measures of coalition outcome. Ordinary least squares analysis is used to examine the relative contribution of each type of diversity to explaining variation in coalition outcome measures.

Developing Evaluation Capacity: An Overview of Two Evaluation Training Curricula

Demonstration Session 319 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG

Chair Daniel McDonald, University of Arizona
Presenters Sherry Betts, University of Arizona
Roshni Menon, University of Arizona
Karen Hoffman Tepper, University of Arizona
Daniel McDonald, University of Arizona

Session Abstract Evaluation is an ongoing process, and an integral part of any successful program. This demonstration is an overview of two evaluation training curricula. Participants will be exposed to several of the activities incorporated into the training curriculum. The first curriculum shows how evaluation relates to programming using logic models, and it introduces people to evaluation: how it is done and why it is important. The second curriculum is designed for those with some basic knowledge of evaluation, and enables participants to develop some concrete skills and resources that they can take back to their communities. This demonstration is recommended for those who support and encourage internal organizational evaluation, or for those who seek a training program that can be used to familiarize non-evaluators with the basics of evaluation. Both curricula are available free of charge through the CYFERNET web site at: http://www.cyfernet.org/.

Theory-based Models in Healthcare Professions

MultiPaper Session 320 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG

Chair John Gargani, University of California at Berkeley

Using a Theory-based Model to Evaluate the Impact of Learning Technologies in Providing Continuing Education for Healthcare Professionals at a Distance
Presenter Anna Taylor, University of Alberta

Abstract Fidelity criteria are increasingly used in program monitoring and evaluation practice. Assessing program fidelity allows evaluators to determine whether poor outcomes reflect failure of the model, or failure to implement the model as intended. This approach is difficult to apply to emerging models (not based on theory or a research demonstration project, e.g., self-help or community programs). We describe steps used to develop, operationalize, test, and refine fidelity criteria in consumer-operated (CO) mental health services: (1) articulating and operationalizing criteria for the model, based on published literature; (2) initial criteria revision and validation from expert judgements; (3) data collection on measures of each criterion from participants, staff and records of consumer-operated programs; (4) assessing discriminant validity through comparisons with structurally similar, non-consumer-operated programs, using participant reports; (5) identifying criteria which distinguish CO vs. non-CO programs; (6) assessing validity of records and staff reports in comparison to consumer reports.

Structures for Analysis to Inform Evaluation of Coordinated Action in Systemic Change Projects

Presenters Gabriel M Della-Piana, University of Texas at El Paso
Connie K Della-Piana, University of Texas at El Paso
Debbie Corey, University of Texas at El Paso
Milijana Suskavcevic, University of Texas at El Paso
Wyona Turner, University of Texas at El Paso
Julie Penley, University of Texas at El Paso
Abstract: This paper illustrates structures for analysis to inform evaluation in complex systemic change projects. In such contexts, the ambiguous and the unexpected threaten to disrupt organizing, and yet people impose coordinated action when faced with the momentarily senseless. Understanding coordinated action as continuous rather than episodic is critical to evaluating systemic change. The paper is grounded in evaluations of systemic education reform projects in technology, mathematics and science, and teacher preparation. The structure of the presentation around which examples from the three settings are embedded includes: 1) Organized improvisation in the face of the momentarily senseless. 2) Identifying essentials of coordinated participant action in responding to conditions of ambiguity, complexity, and unexpected variation. 3) Identification of what is to be coordinated. 4) Reducing the volume and complexity of what is to be coordinated. 5) Assessing residual dysfunctions in coordinated action. 6) Implications for stakeholders' engagement in reporting on findings.

Assessing Consumer-operated Mental Health Services: Program Fidelity

Presenters: Mark C Holter, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Carol T Mowbray, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor

Abstract: Fidelity criteria are increasingly used in program monitoring and evaluation practice. Assessing program fidelity allows evaluators to determine whether poor outcomes reflect failure of the model, or failure to implement the model as intended. This approach is difficult to apply to emerging models (not based on theory or a research demonstration project, e.g., self-help or community programs). We describe steps used to develop, operationalize, test, and refine fidelity criteria in consumer-operated (CO) mental health services: (1) articulating and operationalizing criteria for the model, based on published literature; (2) initial criteria revision and validation from expert judgements; (3) data collection on measures of each criterion from participants, staff and records of consumer-operated programs; (4) assessing discriminant validity through comparisons with structurally similar, non-consumer-operated programs, using participant reports; (5) identifying criteria which distinguish CO vs. non-CO programs; (6) assessing validity of records and staff reports in comparison to consumer reports.

Evaluating Technology in K-12 Education

MultiPaper Session 321 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair: Michael J Stevens, State University of New York

Lessons Learned from a Five-year Technology Innovation Challenge Grant Project in Seattle Public Schools

Presenter: Changhua Wang, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Abstract: The Seattle Public Schools' Community of Learners System is one of 24 projects across the country that received a five-year award under the Challenge Grants for Technology in Education from the U.S. Department of Education in October 1996. The overall goals of the Challenge Grants for Technology are to improve student learning through use of educational technologies and to increase student access to technology. The Seattle Technology Challenge Grant aims at developing a comprehensive model for restructuring schools that includes providing opportunities for staff development in use of technology, parent involvement, and offering curricula that fully integrate technology and School-to-Work concepts. Based on the evaluation data collected over the five years through pre and post-assessment, focus groups/interviews, case studies, and participating teachers' reflections, this presentation summarizes the lessons learned on integrating technology into teaching and learning in 15 Seattle public schools.

Project Lift-off Evaluation: A Multi-method Evaluation from a Systemic Perspective

Presenters: Arron Service, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Kenji Yamazaki, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Georgia K Hughes, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Abstract: Applied Research Consultants (ARC) was asked to contribute supplemental information toward the evaluation of a new curriculum intended to increase the use of technology in the instruction of student teachers (Project Lift-off) at a Midwestern university. By integrating technology into the instruction of student teachers, university representatives were hopeful that graduating student teachers would have an increase in positive attitudes and beliefs toward the use of technology in instruction. Positive attitudes and beliefs may lead to an increased willingness to integrate technology into instruction. Through the use of multiple methods (11 focus groups, 4 surveys, artifact examination) and the solicitation of information from the many stakeholders involved (student teachers, faculty, field teachers), the Project Lift-off Evaluation provides an interesting example of how multiple methods can be used to evaluate programs that hope to produce systemic change (the integration of technology into instruction).

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Technology in Schools and Classrooms

Presenter: Paula J Roberts, Western Michigan University

Abstract: This proposal outlines the evaluation of a school's technology plan. The evaluation notes the fact that just as important as learning what
works, we must learn what does not work. It must not be assumed that everything that employs technology is going to be successful. That is why evaluation is so important. It must be used to create positive change. The Secretary’s Conference on Educational Technology: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Technology, noted a shift in school’s focus on technology. Where once the emphasis was on building and implementing a technology infrastructure, today it is on evaluation the effectiveness of its use in schools and classrooms. Parents and teachers, school boards and administrators, governors and state legislatures, and Congress all want to know if the nation’s investment in technology is providing a return in student achievement.

**Creating the Foundation for a Systemic Approach to the Evaluation of Information and Communication Technology in Teaching and Learning**

**Abstract**

Seven Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Centers (TTURCs) were established in 1999 via funding by NCI, NIDA, and RWJF to:

1. **Tracking.** Preliminary findings suggest that reliability, statistical analyses, practical significance, and validity may be issues for further investigation.
2. **Research Design.**
3. **Reliability.**
4. **Validity.**
5. **Statistical Analyses.**
6. **Effect Size or Practical Significance Measures.**
7. **Attrition Control.**
8. **Implementation**

A standard of “accuracy” as outlined by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. Seven criteria were used to rate evaluation accuracy:

1. **Evaluation of Adolescent Smoking Prevention Programs: An Accuracy Check**

**Presenters**

- Elaine Van Melle, Queen's University at Kingston
- Luigia Cimellaro, Queen's University at Kingston

**Abstract**

One vision for Ontario schools is to integrate information and communication technology (ICT) into the many structures and activities of schooling. The assumption is that such efforts will profoundly change and improve both teaching and learning. Education officials acknowledge that such a transformation requires more than simply increasing student and teacher access to ICT. Rather, given the diversity of school settings, system-wide ICT integration and implementation must necessarily be defined in multiple ways. For this reason, any evaluation of a multi-site program of ICT infusion must generate information to help understand contextual variability and its influence on decision making. This paper presents a foundation for designing such an evaluation. The distillation of multiple contextual variables into five essential qualities helped to reveal a Spiral of Sustainability. The paper also describes how this spiral can be used to assist a school in moving forward with ICT initiatives in locally appropriate ways.

**Using Diverse Evaluation Methods to Focus on Public Health Programs**

**MultiPaper Session 322 to be held in the Fairfax room**

**Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**

Arthur E Blank, Albert Einstein College of Medicine

**Home Visitor Curricula and Training Evaluation**

**Presenter**

Barbara F Foster, The Policy Group for Florida's Families and Children

**Abstract**

This session will provide a presentation of the third-party evaluation conducted for the Florida Department of Health by the Lawton and Rhea Chiles Center for Healthy Mothers and Babies at the University of South Florida. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of the Partners for a Healthy Baby home visiting curricula and training for Healthy Start and Healthy Families Florida home visiting staff members and their supervisors in order to enhance: - The staff's knowledge of infant brain development, - The staff's effective utilization of the infant brain development information with families, - The client's knowledge of infant brain development, and - The client’s utilization of the brain development information. The design included the development of a logic model and used qualitative and quantitative techniques. The methodology, findings and political impediments to systems reform will be discussed in this session.

**Meta-evaluation of Adolescent Smoking Prevention Programs: An Accuracy Check**

**Presenters**

- Marie L DeSimone, Oak Ridge Military Academy
- Lynne R Tingle, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Benjamin G Covington, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

**Abstract**

Smoking prevention programs have been shown to have the greatest effect on curtailing teenage smoking. Consequently, a variety of interventions have been implemented and evaluated over the past two decades. However, there has been no research that has focused on the quality of the evaluations of these programs to determine whether the current thinking on effective programming is accurate. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to apply the technique of meta-evaluation to determine the level of quality of school-based smoking prevention program evaluations. This study focused on the standard of “accuracy” as outlined by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. Seven criteria were used to rate evaluation accuracy: 1) Research Design, 2) Reliability, 3) Validity, 4) Statistical Analyses, 5) Effect Size or Practical Significance Measures, 6) Attrition Control, 7) Implementation Tracking. Preliminary findings suggest that reliability, statistical analyses, practical significance, and validity may be issues for further investigation.

**Development of an Evaluation System for the Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Centers (TTURCs)**

**Presenters**

- William M Trochim, Cornell University
- Glen Morgan, National Cancer Institute
- Stephen Marcus, National Cancer Institute
- Louise Masse, National Cancer Institute
- Ginny Hsieh, National Cancer Institute

**Abstract**

Seven Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Centers (TTURCs) were established in 1999 via funding by NCI, NIDA, and RWJF to:
focus on outcomes for ALL students. To provide measures of accountability for all students, the data must be disaggregated so that the performance of... measuring systems. The TTURCs then collaboratively reviewed content areas and proposed nearly 250 specific measures across the 13 content clusters. These were entered into a database, classified both by content area and by potential measurement method, and a panel of evaluation measurement experts developed a draft measurement system that was then reviewed by the TTURCs, pilot tested and revised. The final evaluation system integrated a variety of evaluation approaches (e.g., survey, coding of progress reports, bibliometric analysis of research publications, peer review) and was designed to address several criteria including feasibility, efficiency, collaboration, and rigor.

What Is The Role Of An Evidence-based Education System in Advancing Gender Equity?
Panel Session 323 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair: Elois Scott, US Department of Education
Discussant: Elois Scott, US Department of Education
Session Abstract: ED is emphasizing the identification and sharing of what works to help educators make informed decisions. We will discuss these premises: 1: Claims should specify if the program has a differential impact on females and males as well as on other populations. This applies to interventions whose main purpose is to increase gender equity as well as programs that have an unintentional equity impact. This means that the evidence to support each claim would be inadequate if it does not provide results that are disaggregated by gender and other appropriate categories. 2: The Gender Equity Expert Panel provided insights on types of evidence available and needed to support claims of positive impact on increasing gender equity for replicable interventions. 3: Educators and evaluators need to be encouraged to report and discuss disaggregated data and to compare their results with national benchmarks to learn if they are decreasing gender gaps.

Introduction to the Panel: Why and How Should An Evidence-based Education System Focus on Gender Equity?
Presenter: Susan S Klein, US Department of Education
Abstract: Sue Klein, OERI, will define gender equity and describe the ED evidence emphases such as the "What Works Clearinghouse". In doing so she will review legislative provisions to disaggregate outcome information by sex or gender and other population characteristics and to ensure that all research, evaluation, statistics and dissemination activities are among other things free of partisan and political influence and racial, cultural, gender or regional bias. She will discuss how claims were used to influence the reporting of evidence related to gender impact by the OERI Expert Panels and other systems designed to review and describe evidence on what works. She will then report on lessons learned from the Gender Equity Expert Panel related to the types of submissions that had impact evaluation evidence and how the panel considered multiple types of evidence to decide if something had a strong or weak causal impact on increasing gender equity outcomes.

Recommendations to Guide Future Evaluation Efforts to Identify and Share What Works to Increase Gender and Other Types of Educational Equity Outcomes
Presenter: Lynn Fox, American University
Abstract: Lynn Fox, Dean School of Education at American University, Washington, DC will describe types of gender equity evaluation that have been recommended by organizations such as the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education and the National Science Foundation’s Program for Women and Girls. Some of the recommendations also come from the work of the Gender Equity Expert Panel which operated between 1997 and 2001 to search for promising and exemplary programs and practices in education that fostered positive outcomes for women and girls. She will describe the importance of mandating reporting requirements that emphasize the following: replicable programs specifically concerned with gender equity; measurable outcomes that map to program claims; and disaggregated data. In addition she will discuss the desirability of disaggregated data requirements for all data reporting in education including those programs that do not have equity as a primary focus.

Why is it Important to Educators to Disaggregate Data by Gender and Other Equity Groups when Conducting and Reporting on Descriptive Information at the Local Level or on the Impact of Replicable Programs?
Presenter: Gypsy Abbott, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Abstract: Gypsy Abbott, Professor, University of Alabama will discuss how the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and other federal legislation focus on outcomes for ALL students. To provide measures of accountability for all students, the data must be disaggregated so that the performance of
subgroups of the population, such as gender, class and ethnicity, can be provided for consumers of educational products and services. In the evaluation of a federally funded program, the Alabama Supercomputing Program to Inspire Computational Research in Education (ASPIRE), she disaggregated data by gender and found evidence to support claims such as gender equitable student success in enrollment, participation and receipt of awards at the state EXPO. This information contributed to the Gender Equity Expert PanelÆs designation of ASPIRE as a Promising Program. In the evaluation of this program, both quantitative and qualitative data were disaggregated. Results indicated quite different outcomes related to gender.

**Coffee and Tea Break**: Coffee and tea are available on the main conference floor outside the ballrooms before and after the first session of the day.
Presidential Strand

The Role of Evaluation in Supporting National Government Decision-making and Reform: A Developing Country Perspective

Panel Session 325 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair Ray C Rist, The World Bank
Discussant Patrick G Grasso, The World Bank
Session Abstract Governments throughout the world--developing and developed--are facing increasing pressures to demonstrate results of their actions. One key means of documenting such results is the use of evaluation for decision making, informing policy options, and learning from present and past actions. While the OECD countries have had a longer history in the development and deployment of evaluation as a management tool, there are also now a number of instances where the same is occurring in developing countries. This panel will explore the development of evaluation as a governance tool in three developing countries--Uganda, Kyrgyzstan, and Malaysia. Each of the three is now some way along in the development of national evaluation systems that are being used to track and feedback on national reform efforts. This panel will focus on both the similarities and differences among the three, drawing out implications for evaluation capacity development, utilization of evaluation in developing countries, and how different governments view the role of evaluation as a management tool.

Building a Monitoring and Evaluation System to Inform National Reforms: The Case of Kyrgyzstan

Abstract The government of Kyrgyzstan has undertaken to shift the resources of the national government towards a concerted effort at poverty reduction. The government is establishing in the Office of the President a performance-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to directly track its efforts. This stands as a notable and exceptional effort for all of Central Asia. This presentation will focus on the efforts the government is making to use M&E information as a means to track the outcomes and impacts on poverty reduction.

Moving to a Performance-based Evaluation System: The Case of Malaysia

Presenter Anwar Shah, The World Bank
Abstract Malaysia has been involved in attempting to measure public sector performance for more than 10 years. It first organized its efforts around the adoption of the TQM principles and measuring against quality enhancement. It has moved in the past few years into a stronger emphasis on building an M&E system that will report on national performance-based goals. The country is an interesting case of one that has seen the need for evaluation and has been adapting evaluation to its information and policy needs over time.

Evaluation and Public Sector Reforms: The Case of Uganda

Presenter Keith Mackay, The World Bank
Abstract Malaysia has been involved in attempting to measure public sector performance for more than 10 years. It first organized its efforts around the adoption of the TQM principles and measuring against quality enhancement. It has moved in the past few years into a stronger emphasis on building an M&E system that will report on national performance-based goals. The country is an interesting case of one that has seen the need for evaluation and has been adapting evaluation to its information and policy needs over time.
rights of human subjects," and being aware of "human interactions." These existing guides provide a strong foundation. The panel aims to build from these by exploring the competencies, questions, and strategies that may be most effective for Evaluators in times of conflict and crises.

**The Case of Internal Evaluation At Ontario Police College**

**Presenter**  
Janice Mokanski, Ontario Police College

**Abstract** By presenting a case study of activities of an internal research and evaluation unit at the Ontario Police College, this session is intended to stimulate discussion about the role of an evaluator as a key support to the management function of a government division. The centralized training model has been the cornerstone of police training in the province of Ontario, Canada since 1963. Within this dynamic political and technical environment, the role of the internal evaluator is constantly shaped and defined by current events as well as the expectations of the ministry and external clientele. I discuss areas where evaluators in similar environments can go wrong and share some strategies that have proven helpful in controversial and contentious situations.

**The Role of Conflict Resolution Skills in Evaluation Practice**

**Presenters**  
Jean A King, University of Minnesota  
Laurie Stevahn, Professional Development Associates

**Abstract** While evaluation textbooks universally acknowledge the inherently political nature of program evaluation, they rarely provide explicit advice on what evaluators might actually do when they encounter conflict in a study. Fortunately, the field of social psychology has studied conflict for decades, both in informal interpersonal settings and in parts of the world where groups engage in armed conflict, providing both theoretical and practical input to aid evaluators. This paper will first summarize research on the dual concerns theory and its application to program evaluation. The second section of the paper will then discuss the interpersonal skills (including conflict resolution skills) that are included in Domain III of the Essential Evaluator Competencies (King et al., 2001) and their use in structuring the curriculum for the University of MinnesotaÆs Evaluation Studies program.

**A Critical Review of the Systems Evaluation Literature: A Comparison with AEA Standards**

**Presenter**  
Kathy M Girton, University of Utah

**Abstract** Beginning with Scriven's definition of Systems Analysis, this critical review of the Systems Evaluation literature will provide an overview of the promising conceptual aspects of and the challenges with our current state of knowledge of systems evaluation. Using a matrix approach, specific attention will be given to systems evaluation theories when the goal is to address conflict and crises in social systems. This matrix will include a comparative examination between the literature and existing AEA principles and standards to identify areas for further developing and reconsidering Evaluation guidelines for moments of human tension, social crisis or organizational conflicts.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**The Systemic Effects of an Evaluation Internship Program on the Intern, the Collaborating Program, and the**

**Overarching Funding Agency**

Panel Session 326 to be held in Ballroom B

**Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**  
Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University

**Discussant**  
Gerhard L Salinger, National Science Foundation

**Session Abstract** Through a case example this panel session describes the potent effects of an evaluation internship program on the interns, the Advanced Technology Education (ATE) projects being served by the evaluation interns, and more generally to the National Science Foundation (NSF) ATE program. Four elements are described: (a) how the program is designed to encourage and facilitate systemic effects; (b) the expectations and activities of interns, as well as the impact of the program on interns; (c) how a collaborating project's principal investigator views the internship program, what elements of the program had the greatest direct and indirect project impacts and supporting evidence for these claims, and how the program might be changed to enhance its effects; (d) the role of the intern's mentor in promoting systemic impact of the program. A discussant will describe the ripple effects beyond the intern program to the larger NSF program.

**An Internship Program Designed to Deliver Systemic Impact on Evaluation at Multiple Levels**

**Presenter**  
Joan P Farland, Western Michigan University

**Abstract** This presentation will describe the structure and support activities of a unique internship program that provides participants with authentic, hands-on experiences in program evaluation. The program, supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF), consists of two parts: an intensive three-week summer institute on evaluation followed by an opportunity for selected institute participants to serve in a paid six-month internship. Each intern assists an NSF-sponsored project's evaluation efforts. To be discussed are features of the internship that are specifically designed to provide systemic evaluation impact, not only on the interns themselves, but also on the projects with which they work and on the continuous improvement of the internship program itself. Findings from external evaluations of the project, conducted by Dr. David Hartmann and Dr. William Wiersma, provide supporting
The Expectations and Activities of Interns as Well as the Impact of the Program on Interns
Presenter: Teresa Boyd, University of Connecticut
Abstract: The MTS internship provided the opportunity to apply conceptual knowledge obtained during the summer Evaluation Institute by evaluating an actual NSF project. As an MTS evaluation intern, I was expected to conduct an evaluation of The Networking Education Teacher Support project (NET-Support). The NET-Support project involved the creation and instruction of a hands-on Internet Protocol addressing and remote router configuration teacher module (IPAM). The IPAM teacher’s guide was created as a curriculum enrichment module for use in a technology classroom to facilitate computer networking teaching and learning. In addition, the project director was interested in assessing changes in students’ interest in computer networking as a technology-based career. My activities focused on providing feedback on the revisions of the IPAM and assessing teachers’ experiences and satisfaction using the IPAM and students’ pre-post learning objectives.

Impacts of an Evaluation Internship on a Collaborating Project
Presenter: Lee Pulis, TERC Inc
Abstract: For the case project, the scope of proposed grant activities was reduced to fit a negotiated award. Evaluation services were cut to preserve central curriculum development and testing goals. The NSF-funded internship offered a welcome solution to restoring evaluation functions and benefits to the project, while adding a human resource development dimension. Preparation for the intern orientation meeting and structured communications from the coordinator refocused attention on evaluation. The project timeline, goals, research questions, and methods were recast in formats suggested by evaluator colleagues (e.g., Fig. 1: Logic Flow Diagram, Fig. 2: Goal Matrix, and Fig. 3: Work Plan). Research and dissemination qualities of the project were improved by inputs from the intern and her mentor, both steeped in state-of-the-art evaluation methods. Project resources were conserved by assigning drafting and document control of specified instruments to the intern, subject to iterative review and comment by project staff.

The Mentor’s Role in Producing a Systemic Effect for the Advanced Technology Education (ATE) Project
Presenter: Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University
Abstract: The internship program includes a mentor designated to assist each intern. The mentor’s role is to serve both the intern and the collaborating project. This presentation will address the characteristics of the mentor and the mentor’s role at three critical points: (a) the initial meeting between the intern and the collaborating project staff person to design the internship experience, (b) the weekly monitoring and assistance role provided through e-mail and telephone exchange, and (c) a site visit that the mentor makes to meet with the intern and collaborating project staff at the ATE project site. The presentation includes observations made by the program’s other mentor, Dr. Jerry Horn, and findings from a metaevaluation of the internship program conducted by Dr. William Wiersma. Input from both sources verify the important role of the mentor, especially in helping the collaborating project apply evaluation more effectively in the larger ATE project.

Developing Evaluation Systems for the Performance of Basic Research Organizations
Panel Session 327 to be held in Ballroom C
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: Irwin Feller, Pennsylvania State University
Discussant: Paul Doremus, National Institute of Standards and Technology
Session Abstract: The panel will address the methodological, analytical and operational issues associated with developing evaluation systems for Federal agencies that support basic research. The Government Performance and Results Act, which requires that federal agencies develop performance plans and document results related to these plans, and the President’s Management Agenda, which calls for the development of investment criteria for basic research programs, have intensified the search by federal agencies for analytically coherent, empirically operational, administratively feasible, and politically credible assessments of agency performance. This panel will discuss the range of methodological approaches being supported to construct valid and credible performance metrics and to nests them within an operationally feasible evaluation system.

Evaluation Design Begins Where Metrics End
Presenters: Irwin Feller, Pennsylvania State University
George Gamota, Science and Technology Management Associates
Abstract: Drawing upon the evaluation criteria of quality, relevance, performance, and international leadership advanced in a series of National Academies reports and recent OMB working papers, this paper (1) critiques existing approaches to performance assessment and evaluation design; (2) develops a set of performance metrics that captures the several different ways in which the Department of Energy’s Office of Science supports basic research, and (3) outlines the building blocks of an implementable evaluation plan. Particular emphasis is placed on the need to develop a methodology and
metrics that capture the interaction of the Office of Science's portfolio of modes of research support (e.g., investigator-initiated grants, laboratory research; facilities, human capital, international collaboration).

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches
Presenter  Bill Valdez, US Department of Energy
Abstract  Recent studies of best practice methods for assessing the performance of basic research programs have emphasized peer review/expert assessment procedures. By these standards, DOE's Office of Science is already performing at the best practice frontier. Systematic procedures for peer review exist both for research conducted at DOE national laboratories and for research supported at universities. The Office of Science now seeks added evidence of the impacts of its research programs through development of quantitative measures. The key criteria for selecting metrics are that they be consistent with the performance of high quality research, credible to both the scientific community and political decision-makers, transparent to all, and administratively feasible.

Evaluating the Formation of Human Capital from Basic Research Programs
Presenters  Juan Rogers, Georgia Institute of Technology
            Barry Bozeman, Georgia Institute of Technology
Abstract  Drawing on a series of case study results of R&D activities funded by DOE and NSF, this presentation will provide lessons for management of R&D with special attention to the formation of scientific and human capital. The knowledge goals of R&D organizations have a significant effect on their structure and evolution over time. Relatedly, how R&D organizations fit within larger networks can affect their performance and evolution. These impacts are not well captured in existing evaluation designs.

Crossing the Digital Divide: Concept Mapping Experiences in Distance Evaluation
MultiPaper Session 328 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG and the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG
Chair  William M Trochim, Cornell University
Discussant  William M Trochim, Cornell University
Session Abstract  Working with multiple stakeholders can be a complicated and time-consuming process. This is made more so when the stakeholders involved are not in the same geographic location. Structured methodologies can help to organize otherwise open-ended complex group tasks. When such processes can, at least in part, be implemented over the web, there is potential for greater efficiency and inclusiveness. Structured conceptualization, or 'concept mapping' is a planning and evaluation methodology that combines structured group processes with multivariate data analysis in a mixed methods participatory framework. New software allows most of the face-to-face aspects of the process to be accomplished in part or in whole over the web, enabling geographically distant stakeholders to engage in a group project without having to physically meet. This panel describes how the concept mapping methodology works, how it has been enabled for use on the web, and presents two in-depth examples of its use. Discussion will address potential advantages (e.g., less time, few or no travel costs) and disadvantages (less engagement and buy-in, added communications costs) of such web-based processes and consider more general implications for distance or distributed evaluation approaches.

Web-based Concept Mapping for Planning and Evaluation
Presenter  William M Trochim, Cornell University
Abstract  Concept mapping is an integrated mixed methods approach that combines standard group processes (brainstorming, pile sorting, ratings) with advanced multivariate statistical analyses (multidimensional scaling, hierarchical cluster analysis) and can be used in a wide variety of planning and evaluation contexts. This paper presents the basic mapping methodology and focuses on how it has been adapted for use on the web. A meta-analysis of prior web-based concept mapping projects summarizes typical project benchmarks such as the rate of brainstorming over time, numbers of statements generated, participation rates in sorting and rating tasks, and so on. The implications of the results for future implementation of this methodology and for web-based evaluation in general are considered.

Creating Selection Criteria for a Teen Center Intervention Program
Presenter  Naomi E Penney, Independent Consultant
Abstract  Health care practitioners used the Concept System Global program to identify and categorize the selection criteria to be used in identifying adolescents most able to benefit from a teen center health intervention. Prior to this project there was no systematic method for selecting adolescents into the program. Concept Mapping allowed practitioners to work on their own time and return to their ideas over the course of several weeks for refinement of ideas. This would not have been possible with a one-time physical meeting. The health care practitioners believed the quality of the data they generated was improved by the web-based program.
Diverse Visions for Evaluation: Should We Integrate or Embrace Diversity?
Panel Session 331 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG
Chair Stewart I Donaldson, Claremont Graduate University
Session Abstract Rather than following a conventional format of assembling evaluators for a panel with similar and complementary views that would reinforce an easily digestible and coherent vision or theme, we have deliberately invited evaluators from diverse, sometimes rival, backgrounds, and from a range of primary disciplines to provide their visions for evaluation in the new millennium. Initially, four panelists will summarize how we should (not how we will) evaluate social programs and problems in the new millennium. Michael Scriven will discuss his vision of evaluation as a transdiscipline. David Fetterman will discuss the promise of empowerment evaluation. Donna Mertens will share her vision for inclusive evaluation. Stewart Donaldson will present his vision for theory-driven evaluation in the new millennium. Next, Melvin Mark will offer his vision of how to integrate these and other diverse visions into an

Responding to the Changing Need for Federal Program Evaluation: The Inspector General Community Perspective
Panel Session 329 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG
Chair Emmalou Norland, US Environmental Protection Agency
Session Abstract This distinguished panel from the Offices of the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Commerce will discuss the evolution of and the future directions for program evaluation within the US Inspector General Community. Specific examples of past successes in program evaluation will set the context for this panel's sharing of its vision for ways in which the Inspectors General can contribute to good government through creative and innovative approaches to more sophisticated evaluations.

Program Evaluation Success and Future Vision for the Environmental Protection Agency Office of Inspector
Presenters Nikki Tinsley, US Environmental Protection Agency
Wendy E Rowe, Fielding Graduate Institute
Kwai Chan, US Environmental Protection Agency
Abstract Within the past few years, the EPA OIG has identified a critical need to develop more sophisticated approaches to assessing EPA program implementation and impact. In response to these needs, an effort to establish the Office of Program Evaluation (OPE) was initiated. Along with the Office of Audit and Office of Investigations, OPE conducts work to help EPA improve its programs and operations which in turn contributes to the EPA mission of improved eco-system and human health.

Inspections and Evaluations: Critical Tools for the Inspector General Community
Presenter Johnnie E Frazier, US Department of Commerce
Abstract As Inspector General for the Department of Commerce and chair of the Inspections and Evaluations Committee of the President's Council for Integrity and Efficiency, this speaker will share thoughts on evaluation as a useful tool for assessing and ensuring federal program economy, efficiency, effectiveness and impact. Examples will show the varied nature of OIG inspections and evaluations and the impact they have had on improving federal programs.

The Long View - Past and Future of Evaluation in Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General
Presenter George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services
Abstract An historical leader in the IG community for successfully utilizing program evaluation, the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General has provided invaluable assistance to other OIGs desiring to implement evaluation approaches. This presentation will provide an opportunity for reflection on the past 15 years since creation of the Office for Evaluation and Inspections, insight into how the work has changed, ideas on best practices and enduring methods and visions for promising venues for the future.

Conceptualizing Best-practice Methods for Community-based Coalitions
Presenter Naomi G Penney, Cornell University
Abstract As part of a dissertation project on conceptualizing community input, a panel of top researchers in the field of community-based research participated in a concept mapping project to share their ideas on best practices for garnering community input. Using the web-based system allowed participation from researchers in California, Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, South Carolina, Louisiana and Maryland without their having to physically meet. The implications for knowledge exchange are considered.
An integrative framework to be used to evaluate social programs in the new millennium. Stewart Donaldson, as chair of the panel, will briefly discuss some of the inherent problems of attempts at integration, and suggest alternatives including embracing diversity in evaluation. Each of the panelists and the participants in the audience will be given the opportunity to comment on the question of "Should We Integrate Diverse Visions for Evaluation or Embrace Diversity."

**Evaluation in the New Millennium: The Transdisciplinary View**

**Presenter**  
Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University

**Abstract**  
Michael Scriven will open the session by articulating his imagined and hoped-for future for the "discipline of evaluation." He hopes to see a profound transformation of the social sciences in the next millennium. Part of this paradigm shift will involve the universal recognition of evaluation as a discipline with clear definition, subject matter, logical structure, and multiple fields of application (e.g., program, personnel, and product evaluation). More specifically, he wants evaluation to become recognized as one of the elite group of disciplines that he calls "transdisciplines." These are unique in that they supply essential tools for other disciplines, while retaining an autonomous structure and research effort of their own.

**Empowerment Evaluation Strikes a Responsive Chord**

**Presenter**  
David Fetterman, Stanford University

**Abstract**  
David Fetterman's vision will offer a simple, logical, and systematic approach to facilitating self-evaluation. He believes evaluation should be designed to help people help themselves. He will argue that we should use evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination and help stakeholders improve their own programs using a form of self-evaluation and critical reflection. The role of the evaluator in the new millennium, according to Fetterman, should be that of a facilitator, coach, critical friend, and knowledgeable colleague with evaluation expertise, rather than simply a judge. Fetterman will advocate using innovative and traditional quantitative and qualitative social science research methods. Where he differs from others is that he puts these tools in the hands of program sponsors, staff members, and participants, using the assistance and guidance of professional evaluators. Finally, he will warn us against methodological overkill, and recommend using the simplest methods needed for the task at hand.

**The Inclusive View of Evaluation: Visions for the New Millennium**

**Presenter**  
Donna M Mertens, Gallaudet University

**Abstract**  
Donna Mertens will present a vision for evaluation that is deliberately inclusiveness of groups that have historically experienced oppression and discrimination on the basis of gender, culture, economic levels, ethnicities/races, sexual orientation, and disabilities, with a conscious effort to build a link between the results of the evaluation and social action. To this end, the inclusive evaluator should attempt to redress power imbalances in society by including all relevant stakeholders in a way that is authentic and that accurately represents stakeholders’ viewpoints. Furthermore, she will argue that inclusive evaluators must be cognizant of issues of social justice that operate in society and impact the definition of social problems. For example, they must be wary of the deficit models that place the blame for social problems in the individual or culture, rather than in the societal response to the individual or cultural group.

**Theory-driven Evaluation in the New Millennium**

**Presenter**  
Stewart I Donaldson, Claremont Graduate University

**Abstract**  
Reflecting on analyses and interpretations of data and lessons learned from the past three decades of social programming, Stewart Donaldson will identify five key problems currently limiting social problem solving through social intervention: 1) inadequate program conceptualization, 2) poor program implementation, 3) insensitive program evaluation, 4) poor stakeholder-evaluator relations, and 5) barriers that prevented cumulative knowledge and wisdom. He will argue that theory-driven program evaluation, a contingency perspective of evaluation matching evaluation approaches and methods with situational demands and practical constraints, is well-positioned to help overcome these problems and improve social problem solving in the new millennium. He will briefly illustrate how to conduct theory-driven evaluation so that it is flexible and feasible across evaluation settings, empowers stakeholders, is inclusive, maximizes design sensitivity, enhances the validity of evaluation conclusions, improves social programs, and contributes to the cumulative knowledge base about social problem solving.

**Toward an Integrative View of the Theory and Practice of Evaluation**

**Presenter**  
Melvin M Mark, Pennsylvania State University

**Building Systems' Capacity to Use Evaluation for Program Assessment and Improvement**

Panel Session 332 to be held in the Washington B room

Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee

**Chair**  
Kathleen B Lynch, Virginia Commonwealth University

**Discussants**  
Sandy L Wilberger, Virginia Commonwealth University  
Chris Frawley, Virginia Commonwealth University
Session Abstract: This session will address the challenges of developing and implementing quality evaluation methods within systems of varying levels of complexity, describing both how system characteristics influence evaluation design as well as how evaluation is itself an instrument of systems change. The use of the program logic model as a tool that can be adapted to meet the evaluation needs of systems ranging from very simple to very complex will be described. The logic model is particularly effective for teaching program staff how to look at their world through an evaluation lens, and assisting them to gain the maximum benefit from the process and results of evaluation. Three evaluation case studies will be presented to illustrate the themes of this session: the VSA arts of Virginia Theatre program, school-based (elementary, secondary) long-range planning and improvement projects, and the Illinois Teacher Education Partnership among university, community college, and school districts.

Balancing the Evaluation Needs of Stakeholders in a Multi-level Organizational System
Presenter: Kasey A McCracken, Independent Consultant
Abstract: Seemingly autonomous community-based programs often operate within the context of a larger organizational system. As a result, the evaluators who work with these programs must consider the unique evaluation needs of stakeholders throughout the organization. While community-level program administrators may be interested in implementing an evaluation system that will contribute to local quality-improvement efforts, individuals working at the state level may have questions related to the program's replicability, and funders at the national level may demand a system to support ongoing outcome monitoring. One of the major challenges for evaluators working to build a system for ongoing evaluation within such a context is helping to prioritize these evaluation demands. This presentation will discuss these issues based on efforts to design an evaluation system for VSA arts Theatre of Loudoun County, Virginia, a program that provides opportunities for individuals with and without physical and mental disabilities to explore the arts through theatre.

Using Logic Models in Evaluating Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Initiatives
Presenter: Kathleen B Lynch, Virginia Commonwealth University
Abstract: With the current emphasis on standards-based reform in education and the ever-increasing demand that schools be held accountable for educational outcomes, more and more public schools are undertaking school-wide improvement initiatives. While most people who work in schools have some familiarity with writing "measurable goals and objectives," these do not always translate easily into clear statements of intended outcomes that everyone can agree upon and understand. This is true at the level of the individual student, the classroom, educational programs, schools, and school divisions. This presentation will illustrate the use of the logic model as a tool for assisting stakeholders in articulating clear statements of intended outcomes, which are critical to designing effective evaluation plans. Several examples of logic models that have been developed collaboratively with school teams will be shared; the direct relationship between the logic model and the identification of evaluation questions, measures, and procedures will be described.

Evaluation of a Collaborative Partnership Among University, Community College and School District Partners
Presenter: Robert N Harris, National-Louis University
Abstract: The Illinois Teacher Education Partnership (ITEP) is a collaborative partnership designed to train pre-service students and provide support for mentoring new teachers in high-need regions. Community college students and "career changers" complete their teacher education at the local community college, receive a National-Louis University degree, and then teach in their local school district. The evaluation must accommodate the complex relationships among the partners and the varied sub-goals of the pre-service and new teacher components. This presentation provides models used to portray the objectives of the program, methods and instruments used to collect information for each objective, and the specific questions those methods attempt to answer. Several parallel models have been developed to accommodate different purposes and audiences. One model portrays the major objectives of the project and a "hot topic." The "hot topic" assures that while we meet the grant requirements, we also respond to reality-based issues of immediate importance.

Emerging Systems Challenges for Evaluators: Exemplars Drawn from Science and Technology Education
Panel Session 333 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chairs: David D Kumar, Florida Atlantic University
James W Altschuld, The Ohio State University
Discussant: Daniel L Stufflebeam, Western Michigan University
Session Abstract: Educational systems in the United States and other countries are under tremendous pressure to improve educational outcomes. This is particularly true in science and technology education. In the Spring of 2002 a new book entitled "Evaluation of Science and Technology Education at the Dawn of a New Millennium" was published. Among other things, it deals with the evaluation of systemic reform initiatives in education, a new model for the training of science teachers and the radically altered role of evaluation in it, the use of international data comparisons to drive systematic change in science education, the effects of context on system reform, how information technology might be evaluated, the evaluation of distance education programs, and many
Challenges and Impacts of Long-term Residential Treatment of Pregnant and Parenting Women

MultiPaper Session 334 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair Kenneth B Burgdorf, Caliber Associates
Discussant James M Herrell, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment
Session Abstract This multipaper session presents findings from the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment’s (CSAT) Residential Women and Children (RWC) and Pregnant and Postpartum Women (PPW) national cross-site evaluation. The RWC/PPW programs provided long-term (6 to 12-months) residential substance abuse treatment through a variety of treatment models. RWC/PPW programs sought to provide effective long-term substance abuse treatment to pregnant and parenting women. The session papers present findings on client post-treatment outcomes and project post-CSAT sustainability, the effect of social support networks on post-treatment relapse, and the challenges of meeting the treatment needs of RWC/PPW children.

Effectiveness and Sustainability of Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Programs for Pregnant and Parenting Women

Presenters Allan W Porowski, Caliber Associates
Angela Wolf, National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Kenneth B Burgdorf, Caliber Associates
Abstract This introductory paper summarizes outcome findings from a cross-site evaluation of 50 residential treatment projects funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. It reports findings in two important and interrelated areas. First, it examines treatment effectiveness for clients as indicated by pre-post change in client drug and alcohol use, criminal involvement, economic well-being, parenting success, and other important outcome dimensions. Post-treatment status was assessed through approximately 900 interviews administered six months after discharge to clients who had received at least 30 days of treatment. Second, the paper examines project sustainability as indicated by projects’ success in obtaining continuation funding after the
Effect of Social Support on Substance Abuse Among Women in a Residential Treatment Setting

Abstract: This study examined the influence of social supports on relapse among RWC/PPW clients. An index was constructed to indicate whether clients' families primarily fought and argued or got along and helped each other, during the 12 months prior to admission and during the 6 months following discharge. Indices also were generated to indicate whether all or most friends were involved in illegal drugs or other criminal activities, and whether spouses abused substances. Logistic regression was used to evaluate their effect on relapse, defined as any use of alcohol or drugs during the 6-month post-discharge period. Post-discharge activities of families and friends were highly significant. Positive activities like getting along and helping each other were associated with lower likelihood of relapse, while negative activities like family fights and drug use or criminal activity by all or most of the client's friends increased the likelihood of relapse. AOD abuse by spouses during the post-discharge period also was strongly related to increased likelihood of client relapse among a subset of married or cohabitating clients.

Evaluation Online Instruction: Perspectives of Teachers and Students

MultiPaper Session 335 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG
Chair: Mark D Bardini, The World Bank

Evaluating Innovative Learning Technology: A Teacher-centered Approach

Presenter: Tim J Weston, University of Colorado

Abstract: Evaluators of educational technological innovations traditionally focus on usability and efficacy. Efficacy has traditionally been evaluated with comparative studies of academic outcomes, and formative evaluation is commonly limited to improvement of graphical interfaces and usability features. While data gathered from these efforts are valuable, many innovations never reach teachers and students because developers fail to address how innovations will fit effectively into schools. The current presentation advocates evaluation practice emphasizing data collection about 1) design features affecting technological adoption, and 2) the best practices and the adoptive use of technology by teachers. Data from formative evaluation using this approach generates design changes that optimize the fit of an innovation into existing technical infrastructure and curriculum frameworks of schools. Data from efficacy studies describe how teachers adapt innovations; best practice cases are archived and formalized in comparative outcome studies. A rationale for this
approach is presented with exemplars of practice.

**Formative Evaluation of an Online Teaching Strategy; Using Mixed Methods to Learn From the Student Experience**

**Presenter**  
Cathleen A Kennedy, University of California at Berkeley

**Abstract**  
This study evaluated a theory-driven instructional strategy that was implemented in two sections of the same course, one online and the other in the classroom. Both were compared with a control course that was taught in the traditional lecture format in the classroom. Focusing on the opt-in nature of online learning environments, the innovative instructional strategy gave learners control of the ways they participated in the course. The author/instructor learned important lessons about how similar students could perform differently in teacher-centered and learner-centered environments. Multiple methods of data gathering and analysis were used to answer questions about what worked well, for whom, and why. Key findings included differing impacts of course structure and delivery mode on student performance and retention, differing reactions of students to individual aspects of an innovative learning environment, and the value of using on-going evaluation to inform practice.

**Evaluating Faculty Via Online Teaching**

**Presenters**  
Robert E Wall, Towson University  
Paul Jones, Towson University  
Paulette Robinson, University of Maryland

**Abstract**  
While faculty work to enhance courses with the latest technologies and to develop and deliver online courses, university merit, promotion and tenure procedures often do not recognize, evaluate or reward this work. At our University this issue critical as more and more faculty are involved not only in utilizing technology to enhance their teaching but also in teaching courses that are online with no face-to-face contact. This presentation will focus on how one department's adaptation of its traditional merit, promotion and tenure evaluation procedures to a new type of teaching. The impetus was the institution's requirement that faculty conduct peer classroom evaluation of instruction will be collected on a regular basis. Questions (e.g. How can faculty be observed online?) began to surface when a faculty member requested an on-line observation. This presentation will report on the procedures developed and our experience implementing this relatively new area of faculty evaluation.

**Measuring Additionality: The Case of the United Kingdom Government's New Deal for Lone Parents**

**Presenters**  
Rebecca Hutten, Department for Work and Pensions  
Anna Bee, Department for Work and Pensions  
Michael Daly, Department for Work and Pensions

**Abstract**  
This paper explores the design, development and implementation of a large-scale, longitudinal survey to estimate the counterfactual position of the UK Government's New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP) programme. NDLP is a national voluntary programme aimed at improving lone parents' employability and increasing their rates of employment. The evaluation of the programme was designed specifically around the use of propensity score matching (PSM) to help estimate the counterfactual and programme impact. The project has involved a large-scale postal survey (70,000 questionnaires), computer modelling and 3,000 face-to-face interviews with a matched sample of programme participants and non-participants. It was the first piece of UK
Government research using PSM on a data set that was collected specifically for the purpose. The paper draws on lessons learnt in using PSM and considers early indications of its success as an evaluation tool in the context of evaluating government welfare to work programmes.

**Experimental Estimates of Family Cap Birth Impacts: Issues of Entry Effects and Caseload Dynamics**

**Presenters**
- Radha Jagannathan, Rutgers University
- Michael J. Camasso, Rutgers University

**Abstract**
This paper addresses the issue of entry effects in experimental designs using data from New Jersey's family cap experiment conducted during October 1992 - December 1996. We adopt a blended approach to estimating the birth impact of the family cap using both experimental and quasi-experimental (pre-post) research designs. Our results show that an experimental sample drawn at a point-in-time yields birth impacts that are quite different from estimates derived from the pre-post analysis of the entire caseload. A sample drawn over a prolonged period, on the other hand, yields estimates of birth that closely mirror those found in the pre-post analysis.

**Estimating Efficacy from Effectiveness Trials**

**Presenters**
- Jim Derzon, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
- J. Fred Springer, EMT Associates Inc
- Elizabeth Sale, EMT Associates Inc

**Abstract**
Phase models specify that prevention research should move from basic to more and more applied settings and framings. Using data from the High Risk Youth Study, a 46-site substance abuse prevention trial for youth aged 9-17, we substitute cross-program bias analysis to estimate efficacy of community based trials for substance abuse. Among the 46 trials, observed effectiveness estimates on 30 day substance abuse ranged from $z = -0.53$ to $0.64$. We hypothesized that these effectiveness estimates were negatively impacted by features of implementation and investigation. Specifically, we believed that low dosage, comparison group contamination, and the absence of program theory depressed estimates. These features explained 30% of the variance in a fixed-effects regression. Controlling the impact of these variables raised the mean effectiveness estimate from $z = 0.02$ (sd=.21) to $z = 0.24$ (sd=.18). This approach avoids much of the cost, rancor, and time explicit in phase research.

**An Application of Hierarchical Linear Models for Determining Differences in 4th Grade Math Achievement Among Chilean Schools**

**Presenter**
Janet Cádiz, Independent Consultant

**Abstract**
The purpose of this study is to explore the application of Hierarchical Linear Models (HLMs) for analyzing fourth grade math student achievement by using the 1999 SIMCE data. This data is different from others SIMCE data because it includes test scores based on Item Response Theory (IRT). To achieve the previous purpose, three types of school administrations are analyzed, Municipal, Private, and Private Subsidized Schools. In this study, One-Way ANOVA Model and Random-Intercept Model are the primary Hierarchical Linear Models developed. The primary results indicate that there are significant differences within and between these schools in math achievement. However, significant variation among students and schools remains to be explained.

---

**Empowerment Evaluation as a Catalyst for Systemic Change: A Comparison of Three Approaches to Training and Technical Assistance**

**Panel Session 337 to be held in the Potomac V room**

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

**Chair**
Barbara Morrison-Rodriguez, BMR Consulting

**Discussant**
Barbara Morrison-Rodriguez, BMR Consulting

**Session Abstract**
The use of empowerment evaluation to facilitate systemic change is growing in the State of Florida. This panel will report on three examples of very different settings and approaches to empowerment evaluation training and technical assistance for foundations, public agencies, and nonprofit organizations. Examples are drawn from (1) a federally funded community-based initiative for the medically uninsured in Jacksonville, FL; (2) a Catholic conversion foundation and its grantees in Southern Florida and (3) a public taxing authority that funds programs for children and families in Hillsborough County, FL. The same trainer/consultant has worked with all three. Ways in which each of these is contributing to systemic change will be emphasized.

**Creating a Service Delivery System for the Medically Uninsured: A Team-based Approach to System Design and Empowerment Evaluation**

**Presenters**
- Rhonda Davis Poirier, Communities-in-Charge of J axonville
- Marry Ann Miller, J ax-Care Communities in Charge

**Abstract**
J ax Care is a federally funded project to create a system of care for the medically uninsured in Jacksonville, FL. From the inception of
the program concept and design, an empowerment evaluation approach was selected to guide a self-critical process of program design, implementation, and outcomes. Four teams were created to use empowerment evaluation in development and assessment of critical areas of pharmacy, case management, information systems integration, and provider profiling/evidence based medicine. This presentation will describe this process.


**Presenter**  Elmima C Johnson, National Science Foundation

**Abstract** The Allegany Franciscan foundation is a Catholic conversion foundation with a mission of service to the poor and empowering people and communities to maximize their potential. Empowerment evaluation as an approach to grantees accountability was selected early in the life of this foundation. This presentation will describe how this foundation has funded and fostered empowerment evaluation training and technical assistance for its grantees, as well as how it has used empowerment evaluation techniques to guide its own strategic grant making efforts.

Building the Capacity of Child-serving Agencies to Evaluate Program Outcomes: A Train-the-trainer Approach to Empowerment Evaluation

**Presenters**  Amy Haile, Children's Board of Hillsborough County

**Abstract** The Children's Board of Hillsborough County is a public independent taxing authority that funds programs that serve children and youth. It has an extensive and well trained professional staff, several of whom are charged with providing training and technical assistance to grantee organizations in numerous areas, including program evaluation. This presentation will describe the use of a "train the trainer" model in empowerment evaluation for staff and the complexities of this model when the empowerment evaluator is also a representative of the funding agency responsible for contract management and oversight.

Building Capacity for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Educational Evaluation

Panel Session 338 to be held in the Potomac VI room

**Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG**

**Chair** Conrad G Katzenmeyer, National Science Foundation

**Discussant** Thomas J Chapel, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**Session Abstract** The National Science Foundation (NSF) for some years has been supporting projects to build capacity in educational evaluation for the benefit of its programs and the field of evaluation. This effort has now been formalized through a comprehensive, three-pronged plan: developing human capital, creating physical resources, and supporting infrastructures of professional evaluation organizations.

This panel will discuss ongoing and future evaluation capacity building activities.

This will include a survey of NSF staff and Principal Investigators regarding evaluation use and how these suggestions can be converted to a web-site for evaluators. There will also be a summary of what NSF has been doing in stimulating the training of minority evaluators and how the topic of cultural context of evaluation can be used to strengthen this effort. Finally, there will be a discussion of NSF's new efforts to encourage training and building of infrastructures.

**Current Capacity Building Resources**

**Presenter**  Joy Frechtling, Westat

**Abstract** Dr. Joy Frechtling of Westat, Inc. has been serving as supervisor of the support contract to the evaluation capacity building program for nearly 10 years. Over this time, a significant number of efforts have occurred. Dr. Frechtling will talk about the findings of a recent survey of program officers regarding evaluation requirements and evaluation needs, describe a new edition of the User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation, and share developments in, and plans for, an evaluation website. Contrasts between initial efforts and today’s efforts will be provided.

**Current Minority Resources**

**Presenter**  Elmima J Johnson, National Science Foundation

**Abstract** Dr. Elmima J Johnson of NSF will discuss the development and preparation of minority evaluators and the cultural context in which evaluation should be practiced. NSF has placed an emphasis on expanding the pool of minority evaluators trained to implement formative and summative evaluations in STEM fields, with competencies in the area of culturally responsive evaluation. It is currently supporting several efforts focused on capacity building that reflect the importance of cultural context as a factor influencing the evaluation process. This presentation will discuss (1) the development of a conceptual framework for evaluator training (2) the design of an evaluation training institute, (3) a meeting of NA evaluators & educators to discuss relevant evaluation issues, and (4) a workshop to orient K-12 teachers in culturally relevant evaluation.

**Current Professional Infrastructure Resources**
Using an Event-based Approach to Evaluate the Performance of Organizational Knowledge Systems

Skill-building Workshop Session 339 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG
Facilitator: Scott A Robbins, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Session Abstract: As more attention is devoted to knowledge management, evaluators serving organizational clients must cultivate research skills and strategies suitable for evaluating organizational knowledge performance. This workshop provides participants with an event-based strategy whereby organizational knowledge performance may be evaluated. Whenever organizations respond to problems, people, and technology-based knowledge resources interact in ways that may be empirically verified. By assessing the knowledge resources that are engaged and the patterns by which the various players interact, the evaluator is able to craft an image of the organization’s knowledge performance during specific response episodes. This provides a starting place from which organizational clients can assess their knowledge capabilities and plan for performance improvement. Starting with reduced data from an actual response episode the participants will be able to immediately practice the featured data analysis and visualization techniques. Ideas for applying the research techniques and resources for extended learning will also be shared.

Roundtables: Professional Practice

Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 10:30 am.
Roundtables Session 340 to be held in the Tidewater room
Chair: Rosalie T Torres, Developmental Studies Center
First Rotation – Table A: Philosophical Reflection on the Guiding Principles for Evaluators

Presenters: David D Williams, Brigham Young University
Courtney Glenn, Brigham Young University
Stephen Yanchar, Brigham Young University

Abstract: In this paper, we apply philosophical analysis and critique in reflecting on several ontological, axiological, and epistemological questions about evaluation as represented by the Guiding Principles for Evaluators, such as: “Is method (epistemology) the most important aspect of evaluation or is ethics really first philosophy as Levinas (1985) suggests? Will we continue to focus our discussion of morality on codes of conduct or consider other definitions of morality? What implications do our theoretical assumptions have for the validity and value of our evaluations? Are the Guiding Principles well-founded philosophically? Are evaluations as commonly practiced based on sound philosophical bedrock? Although we will not answer these questions conclusively, the very asking should help participants explore their own assumptions more thoughtfully, which we hope will lead them to reflectively apply the Guiding Principles and expand upon them to better address their own assumptions about what it means to evaluate.

First Rotation – Table B: Using Formative Evaluation for Institutional Development: Proposing a Center for Evaluation at the University of Alberta

Presenters: Matthew M Gushta, University of Alberta
Stanley J Varnhagen, University of Alberta

Abstract: Responding to demands for increased accountability at the institutional, governmental, and corporate levels, a center for evaluation is being proposed at the University of Alberta, Canada. The proposed evaluation center will provide consultative and administrative services for a wide variety of evaluation projects solicited by both internal and external clients. This center will provide evaluation consultation services as well as evaluation management, facilitation, and design. A dynamic political climate and ongoing reconstitution of the stakeholder group throughout the proposal’s development necessitates continuous reassessment and revision of the objectives and processes. Only a formative approach to the development of the proposal is appropriate for handling the demands of a changing environment. This paper details the formative evaluation process as applied to the development and implementation of a center for evaluation.

First Rotation – Table C: See One, Do One, Teach One: The Use of Class Evaluation Projects to Teach Evaluation Skills to Graduate Students

Presenter: Michael S Shafer, University of Arizona
Abstract
This roundtable discussion will provide a systematic description of how to solicit, select, and assign community based program evaluation projects to graduate student work teams enrolled in program evaluation classes. A project milestone evaluation system will be described in which students are required to submit various aspects of their program evaluation projects throughout the semester with the completion of each milestone adding toward the completion of their final project report. Additionally, procedures for ensuring and monitoring group cohesion and parity in work will be discussed. Finally, evaluative information from both the students and the participating agencies will be presented. As a result of attending this roundtable discussion, participants will gain ideas for implementing or improving upon their use of group evaluation projects in their own teaching activities.

First Rotation - Table D: Of Dolls and Teddy Bears: Addressing Transitional Issues to Promote Systemic Change Through Program Evaluation
Presenter Eric J Mundy, University of Akron
Abstract Program evaluations can be considered threats to established organizational structures, and barriers may arise that obstruct the utilization of evaluation findings. This demonstration explores and brings to light one such obstacle, what psychoanalysts refer to as transitional phenomena. Individuals basically garner identity and security from objects or things considered to be transitional phenomena throughout their lives, such as dolls and teddy bears in early years and organizations and social programs in later years. This discussion will maintain that when transitional phenomena, such as existing programs, are challenged, that is evaluated, the basic identities of those charged with administering the program are also challenged. Knowledge of such phenomena will add to the understanding of how individuals engage and construct their professional reality, and subsequently interpret and accept evaluations. As such, addressing such phenomena will help facilitate the usage of evaluation findings into systemic change.

Second Rotation - Table A: Creating An Evaluation Center: A Means to Facilitate Reform?
Presenters Stanley J Varnhagen, University of Alberta
Brad Arkison, University of Alberta
Matthew M Gushta, University of Alberta
Anna Taylor, University of Alberta
David Grace, University of Alberta
Myrna Sears, University of Alberta
Abstract At the University of Alberta, those engaged in evaluation are found in isolated pockets in a few departments across campus with little communication or sharing of ideas between groups. Our larger academic evaluative group currently is able to handle a number of different evaluative tasks internally that might be difficult for some of the other evaluators on campus. However, even this larger group of evaluators, because of limited resources and its position on campus, has found it challenging to publish at desired levels and include student involvement. Currently, lessons learned from one study are seldom available to those who could potentially use the information. This paper is about the need for and process of attempting to create an Evaluation Center that will help facilitate evaluative research, bring together evaluators across campus as a way to address these problems, advance the field, and facilitate evaluative reform.

Second Rotation - Table B: Evolution of a Multiprofessional Service Learning Course: A Ten-year Perspective
Presenters Cheryl L Meyer, Wright State University
Carla Clasen, Center for Healthy Communities
Annette Canfield, Center for Healthy Communities
Kate Cauley, Center for Healthy Communities
Paula Reams, Center for Healthy Communities
Abstract Ten years ago we created a course entitled Multiprofessional Community Based Team Practice in Primary Care. As we conceptualized this course, students from seven health professions would enroll, complete some didactic work and then work in multidisciplinary teams on a ten-week project in the community. Each team would have an academic and community faculty facilitator. This course now enrolls approximately 40 students from nursing, medicine, social work, psychology and physician assistant programs. There are six academic faculty who team-teach the didactic portion of the course and six community faculty who serve as on site supervisors for the community based project. As the course has evolved, we have incorporated made significant changes based on extensive student, faculty and community evaluations. In this presentation, we will track the impact of the evaluative function on the ongoing development of the course. We will also address future directions for the course.

Second Rotation - Table C: Have Methods, Will Travel: Pros and Cons of Being a Generalist Evaluator
Presenter Leslie J Cooksy, University of Delaware
Abstract While many evaluators are associated with a specific philosophical perspective, methodological approach, and/or program area, some are generalists. This roundtable will draw on the presenter’s 14 years as a generalist to address the implications of this path for one’s career and the
quality of one’s evaluation work. After graduating from a doctoral program in program evaluation in 1989, the presenter has worked in the federal government, a traditional academic department, and an applied research center. Her projects have been in the areas of community development, employment and training, early intervention and education, international agricultural research, and child mental health services, among others. She has worked with community organizations, local nonprofit agencies, state and federal governments, and international coalitions. The roundtable will use this range of experiences as the foundation for a discussion about the pros and cons of being a generalist evaluator.

Second Rotation – Table D: Evaluation Coach and Role Model: Evaluation Capacity Building Through Logic Models

Presenter: Julie M Patterson, Center for Adolescent Health

Abstract: Logic models are valuable tools, used to help focus program planning and evaluation design. However, can they be useful teaching tools? Does the creation of a logic model for the evaluation technical assistance program help the participants in it better understand evaluation and the steps involved in evaluation design? This paper argues that the logic model of the evaluation technical assistance program itself is a valuable resource in training practitioners to use logic models and value the program evaluation process. By modeling clear thinking and responsible program planning, the evaluation trainer can function as both coach and role model. The example of the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Child and Family Health Services Program will be presented and discussed.

Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program: State and National Implications of a Plan for Evaluating a State-wide Migrant Education Program

Panel Session 341 to be held in the Kennedy room

Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

Chair: Helen Suarez DeCasper, SERVE

Discussant: Francisco Garcia, US Department of Education

Session Abstract: This panel will discuss the state and national implications of the evaluation of a program for the education of children of migratory workers. The researchers will report on the history and status of the program, the impetus for the evaluation, the evaluation model designed to address the complexity of the program, the outcomes and recommendations, the impact of the evaluation on the program. The evaluation focuses on finding valid and reliable methods for verifying the effectiveness of services and determining ways to improve those programs during subsequent years. The evaluation focused on the degree to which migrant education programs in Pennsylvania are in compliance with federal requirements and the level of effectiveness of the program. Throughout the focus is on quality programming while providing equitable access to programs and services for migrant children and families.

Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program Evaluation: History and Development

Presenter: Paula Errigo Stoup, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Abstract: The author will give the introductory talk setting the stage for the evaluation. This paper will give a history of migrant education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and present the decentralized structure of the program. Pennsylvania is unique in its delivery of services through university entities and Intermediate Units. The advantages of this management and delivery model is that each service unit is enabled to design services that meet the particular needs of the students, their families and the schools they attend. The presenter will discuss the impetus for the evaluation, including the issues that emerged that led to the request for proposals to evaluate the program. Finally, the presenter will address the importance of a comprehensive evaluation to the continued growth and improvement of the program.

Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program Evaluation: Design and Implementation

Presenter: Jean Williams, SERVE

Abstract: The presenter, the principal investigator, describes the importance to the field of migrant education of a state-wide evaluation. She will outline her approach to addressing the unique aspects of this program through the evaluation design. She will explore the design of the study, instrumentation, stakeholder identification, the scope of the information to be collected, and the sampling design. She will discuss the practical aspects that shaped the evaluation, such as sampling sites across the state, rural and urban settings, and at various times of the year when different programs are offered. Finally she will provide the extensive data-gathering and analysis process that was followed to answer the key evaluation questions.

Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program Evaluation: Results, Recommendations, Implications

Presenter: Helen Suarez DeCasper, SERVE

Abstract: This presenter, the primary evaluator, will describe the results of the evaluation, including the recommendations and implications for future work. The key component of this paper is the discussion of the impact of the program on the achievement of migrant students in Pennsylvania. The author will examine the role of the program in student academic attainment, including the role of parents in their child’s education; the efforts to recruit migratory students to schools, the role of the program in supporting classroom teachers; and other key programmatic components. Finally, the outcomes,
recommendations, and implications of the evaluation will be presented and discussed.

**Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program Evaluation: State and National Implications**

**Presenter**  
Manuel Recio, Pennsylvania Department of Education

**Abstract**  
The author, Director of Migrant Education, will discuss how the Division of Migrant Education has utilized the information from the evaluation since it was completed in February, 2002. Included in his paper is how the division staff have shared the results of the evaluation with state policy makers, program staff, school district personnel, advisory groups, and partners. He will also examine the the impact of the evaluation process and results on the development of the program. Finally, he will discuss the implications of this evaluation study on the national migrant education community.

---

**Evaluation in Social Service Agencies: Implications for Reform**

MultiPaper Session 342 to be held in the Jefferson room

Sponsored by the Social Work and the Human Services Evaluation TIG

**Evaluating the Impact of Increased Caseloads on Social Workers: How Can the System Be Reformed**

**Presenters**  
Michele Weber, Southwest Counseling & Development Services  
Shakira Kennedy, Neighborhood Youth & Family Services

**Abstract**  
This evaluation examines the impact of increased caseloads of social workers in two different non-profit social service agencies from two states. The first agency is located in Bronx, New York, which offers preventive services and the other offers community mental health services in Detroit, Michigan. This presentation discusses how the system can be reformed through innovative approaches. The sample population was randomly selected within these two agencies and is composed of case workers/case planners, therapists and supervisors who carry a caseload. This presentation will elaborate on the evaluation findings by showing: 1) how effective the current system is; and 2) how reforms can be used to benefit the larger system. Ultimately, the recommendations from this evaluation can be used to help inform social service agencies on the distribution of caseloads to workers, and the importance of evaluation on the larger system.

**Examples of Realist Evaluation Practice**

**Presenters**  
Mansoor AF Kazi, University of Huddersfield  
Robert Taylor, University of Huddersfield  
Kathleen Firth, Calderdale & Huddersfield NHS Trust  
Avril Henson, St Luke's Hospital  
Sandra Lickess, St Luke's Hospital

**Abstract**  
The paper reports on a realist evaluation of adult rehabilitation programmes in the Huddersfield NHS Trust, West Yorkshire in England (Kazi 1998), up to the year 2002. The programmes provide services for people aged over 65 years who suffer acute conditions affecting their ability to live independently. The method included the integration of single-subject designs into the practice of three teams, to systematically track outcomes using standardised measures. The data analysis to date includes over 400 patients. Each case is systematically tracked, and the results across the larger numbers of cases are aggregated using group designs and inferential statistics which enable comparisons between different types of interventions, client characteristics and contexts. The integration of the realist evaluation research procedures into practice enables a collaborative relationship between evaluation and the systemic context of the agency. Realist evaluation explains how the interventions interact with the client circumstances to produce the programme outcomes.

**Measuring Organizational Culture in Mental Health Settings**

**Presenter**  
Jeannette Waegemakers- Schiff, University of Calgary

**Abstract**  
The functions and purposes of human service organizations lend themselves to a set of values, attitudes and beliefs that are contradistinct from those in the business (corporate) world: values that emphasize human dignity and worth rather than the functional utility of the workplace; cooperation rather than competition; interdependence as opposed to independence; caring over conflict. This presentation describes the findings of a study of organizational culture in mental health clinics. Based on theories of organizational dynamics, social work supervision, administration, and social work values, a 72-item, questionnaire (the OCMH) was developed. This instrument and a comparison instrument, the OCI, were administered to 227 staff in 17 mental health clinics. This resulted in six dimensions of organizational culture that emphasized professional values, interprofessional interactions, satisfaction with service, of a sample of patients drawn from a subset of clinics, was correlated with the factors derived from the factor analysis of both instruments.

---

**Methods Matter: Critical Reflection on the Application of Evaluation Methods Across Cultures**
Evaluating Conceptual Agreement: A Pattern Matching Approach

Demonstration Session 344 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG
Facilitator Scott Rosas, Office of Prevention and Early Intervention
Session Abstract This presentation focuses on the application of a pattern matching approach used to assess the level of agreement between program administrators and service providers. Specifically, a structured conceptualization methodology will be demonstrated in an effort to articulate similarities and differences in the theoretical measurement and outcome patterns of administrators and providers. A brief overview of the pattern matching approach, including the structured conceptualization steps will be presented, followed by an example of its application conducted with an existing family support and parent empowerment program. The presentation will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the approach, including methodological issues encountered in the example illustrated. Attendees will gain an understanding of how the pattern matching approach can be used to articulate program assumptions, develop a program theory and outcome framework, and assess the degree of conceptual correspondence between administrators and providers. Implications for program measurement, training, and model refinement will be discussed.
Understanding Student Learning and Achievement

MultiPaper Session 345 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG

Chair       Marco A Munoz, Jefferson County Public Schools
Discussant  Maria D Whitsett, Austin Independent School District

Furthering Our Understanding of the Effects of Educational Programs for Standard English Language Learners: Mixed-methods Evaluation

Presenter   Xiaoxia Ai, Los Angeles Unified School District

Abstract    The low academic performance of African American students is well documented in the research literature. Explanations of this underachievement range from social, political, to economic factors. The Oakland Public Unified School Board's 1996 proposition has drawn public's attention to the hypothesis that the involvement of a teacher sensitive to the culture and customs of a child's family seems to be imperative to the success of early childhood education programs for language minority students. This was one of the key components in a language intervention program initiated in one of the largest urban public school districts in the nation more than 10 years ago. Set within the context of this program evaluation, the current study seeks to examine the effectiveness of the key component, that is, enhancing teachers' awareness and correct attitude toward minority students' language and its connection to student academic achievement through teachers' enhanced application of program key strategies that aim to motivate African American students to master standard English. The study involved 61 randomly selected early primary grade program and comparison teachers/classrooms (2nd and 3rd). The multiple student outcome indicators consisted of: (1) students' scores on the Language Assessment Measures that focus on specific linguistic feature differences between standard English and African American English; (2) students' scores on the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey that measure student attitude toward reading; and (3) matched student gain scores in Stanford 9 reading, language, and mathematics. The implementation measures included: (1) teachers' self-report of participation in various professional development activities; (2) teachers' self-report of their beliefs in and attitudes toward African American English and awareness of the program goals; and (3) direct classroom observations of the application of key program strategies in the classroom. The key evaluation method consisted of hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analyses and a mini case study of high program implementers. HLM analyses investigated the relationship between the level of program implementation and student outcomes. Case study attempted to understand what a successful program classroom looks like and why it is successful. Results indicated that in general the level of program implementation was extremely low across teachers and the effectiveness of the program remains questionable.

Learning in Small Classes: Using Evaluation to Understand How the Process of Learning Differs in Smaller Classes

Presenter   Janice E Noga, University of Cincinnati

Abstract    The Centerville District 15:1 Project was initiated to reduce class size in kindergarten and first grade classrooms. The evaluation focused on classroom process and factors affecting the experiences of kindergarteners and first-graders including. Results indicated that teachers in 15:1 classrooms taught more material more frequently, advancing the pace and depth of instruction and supporting individual inquiry beyond the immediate learning objectives of the class. More students in 15:1 classes attained basic proficiency in grade level skills earlier in the school year resulting in higher outcomes on standardized outcome measures. Systemic elements contributing to classroom practice were identified and assessed separately from direct instruction. When taken into account with class size, children in small classes learned more material more quickly over the course of the school year and were more engaged in instructional activities than children in larger classes.

Measuring Fundamental Concepts: Severity and Functioning

MultiPaper Session 346 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG

Chair       Lee B Sechrest, University of Arizona

Abstract    The measurement of severity and functioning are central to many treatment studies, both as outcome variables and as potential confounds. Severity is not the same construct as functioning, and severity itself can be multifaceted. An unambiguous understanding of severity and functioning is needed to guide instrument selection and development. These theoretically specified factors can be used to guide the selection of multiple indicators, and allow for the use of latent variable modeling techniques. This panel will explore issues involved in the measurement of severity and functioning in several populations. We will present several empirical models of functioning and severity, and will address the relative merits of indicators used in these models.

Toward a Multidimensional Model of Severity in Mental Illness

Presenter   Michelle Stewart, University of Arizona
Abstract: Various terms are used to describe the severity of psychiatric disturbance in the field of mental health, particularly in serious mental illness. Severity is often treated as a unidimensional global construct, and measured as a single item. A coherent theoretical approach to understanding what constitutes severity is lacking. This paper critically examines the treatment of psychiatric severity as a global construct and argues that a multidimensional view of severity is warranted. Using schizophrenia as an illustrative example, the dimensions needed to adequately assess the severity of mental illness are explicated. A multidimensional model of severity as a latent construct with multiple causal indicators is proposed and recommendations for methods to test the model are outlined. Criteria for assessing the appropriateness of existing measures of severity are presented.

Assessing Level of Functioning in Mental Illness
Presenter: Gwendolyn Johnson, University of Arizona
Abstract: Level of functioning (LOF) has increasingly become a critical issue within the mental health field. Policy makers use LOF to compare costs and benefits, mental health care organizations use LOF to track client progress and evaluate new treatments, and agencies use LOF to evaluate individuals who are seeking services. Clients with serious mental illness are an extremely heterogeneous group in terms of presentation, characteristics and needs, however a great deal of uniformity exists in their high level of service utilization. This study examines the reliability of a structured clinical interview designed to assess level of functioning in SMI populations. The interview schedule consists of six scales that assess observable behavior, daily living skills, problem severity, and results in a functional score. The interview was conducted with a sample of 350 SMI clients in Southern Arizona. Three key relationships were investigated: 1) items to problem severity ratings, 2) items to functional scores and, 3) problem severity ratings to functional scores.

Illness and Severity in Context
Presenter: Shelagh Mulvaney, University of Arizona
Abstract: Level of functioning (LOF) has increasingly become a critical issue within the mental health field. Policy makers use LOF to compare costs and benefits, mental health care organizations use LOF to track client progress and evaluate new treatments, and agencies use LOF to evaluate individuals who are seeking services. Clients with serious mental illness are an extremely heterogeneous group in terms of presentation, characteristics and needs, however a great deal of uniformity exists in their high level of service utilization. This study examines the reliability of a structured clinical interview designed to assess level of functioning in SMI populations. The interview schedule consists of six scales that assess observable behavior, daily living skills, problem severity, and results in a functional score. The interview was conducted with a sample of 350 SMI clients in Southern Arizona. Three key relationships were investigated: 1) items to problem severity ratings, 2) items to functional scores and, 3) problem severity ratings to functional scores.

Estimating Impairment, Functioning, and Disability in Children with Cerebral Palsy
Presenter: Melinda Davis, University of Arizona
Abstract: Cerebral palsy is a condition that affects the whole child. Numerous measures have been used to quantify severity from a variety of perspectives. The plethora of measures makes it difficult to compare across studies. The disablement model (NCMRR, 1993) provides a coherent structure that describes and organizes outcome measures in developmental disabilities, including impairment, functional limitations, and disability. We report on a multitrait-multimethod study that includes multiple raters, multiple instruments, and multiple traits. Nearly sixty children with spastic cerebral palsy were assessed by five raters using eight measurement tools; physical therapist assessments, parental questionnaires, osteopathic and allopathic assessments, and four standard instruments; the GMFM, PEDI, WeeFIM, and CHQ. This MTMM study provides the unique opportunity to empirically test the disablement model. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been used to identify the best indicators for impairment, functional limitation, and disability, and to estimate the relationship between these latent variables.

The Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement (CIRCLE) Project Evaluation: Implementing a Participatory Evaluation In Indian Country
Panel Session 347 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG
Chair: Winifred L Reed, US Department of Justice
Discussant: Norena Henry, US Department of Justice
Abstract: The CIRCLE Project is a three-year Federal initiative designed to empower American Indian Communities to fight crime, violence and substance abuse more effectively. Its goal is to assist communities in addressing local problems in a comprehensive way through effective planning and appropriate funding. The evaluation is participatory and has been planned and is being managed by the National Institute of Justice with active participation from the CIRCLE project sites and the Federal CIRCLE Project Team. The three CIRCLE Project sites are the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni. The goals of the first completed phase of the evaluation were to: * Gain insights about the development of the CIRCLE Project and the three site tribes’ specific strategies; * Track the implementation of the tribal strategies; * Develop insights about the existing environment or context
The CIRCLE Project Evaluation: Implementing a Participatory Evaluation in Indian Country from the Perspective of the National Evaluator

Presenter: Miriam Jorgensen, Harvard University

Abstract: The CIRCLE Project is a three-year Federal initiative designed to empower American Indian Communities to fight crime, violence and substance abuse more effectively. Its goal is to assist communities in addressing local problems in a comprehensive way through effective planning and appropriate funding. The evaluation is participatory and has been planned and is being managed by the National Institute of Justice with active participation from the CIRCLE project sites and the Federal CIRCLE Project Team. The three CIRCLE Project sites are the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni. The goals of the first completed phase of the evaluation were to: 1) Gain insights about the development of the CIRCLE Project and the three site tribes’ specific strategies; 2) Track the implementation of the tribal strategies; 3) Develop insights about the existing environment or context (including the influence of tribal culture and government) on the strategies developed by each of the tribes; 4) Develop insights about the progress and outcomes of the strategies; 5) Describe partnerships within the tribes, and between tribal and non-tribal (especially Federal) agencies; and 6) Lay the groundwork for the longer-term evaluation. This presentation will focus on lessons learned regarding the participatory evaluation approach from the perspective of the national evaluator.

The CIRCLE Project Evaluation: Implementing a Participatory Evaluation in Indian Country from the Perspective of the Northern Cheyenne

Presenter: Yvonna H Thompson, Dull Knife Memorial College

Abstract: The CIRCLE Project is a three-year Federal initiative designed to empower American Indian Communities to fight crime, violence and substance abuse more effectively. Its goal is to assist communities in addressing local problems in a comprehensive way through effective planning and appropriate funding. The evaluation is participatory and has been planned and is being managed by the National Institute of Justice with active participation from the CIRCLE project sites and the Federal CIRCLE Project Team. The three CIRCLE Project sites are the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni. The goals of the first completed phase of the evaluation were to: 1) Gain insights about the development of the CIRCLE Project and the three site tribes’ specific strategies; 2) Track the implementation of the tribal strategies; 3) Develop insights about the existing environment or context (including the influence of tribal culture and government) on the strategies developed by each of the tribes; 4) Develop insights about the progress and outcomes of the strategies; 5) Describe partnerships within the tribes, and between tribal and non-tribal (especially Federal) agencies; and 6) Lay the groundwork for the longer-term evaluation. This presentation will focus on lessons learned regarding the participatory evaluation approach from the perspective of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

The CIRCLE Project Evaluation: Implementing a Participatory Evaluation in Indian Country from the Perspective of the Pueblo of Zuni

Presenter: Ruth Haskie, University of New Mexico

Abstract: The CIRCLE Project is a three-year Federal initiative designed to empower American Indian Communities to fight crime, violence and substance abuse more effectively. Its goal is to assist communities in addressing local problems in a comprehensive way through effective planning and appropriate funding. The evaluation is participatory and has been planned and is being managed by the National Institute of Justice with active participation from the CIRCLE project sites and the Federal CIRCLE Project Team. The three CIRCLE Project sites are the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni. The goals of the first completed phase of the evaluation were to: 1) Gain insights about the development of the CIRCLE Project and the three site tribes’ specific strategies; 2) Track the implementation of the tribal strategies; 3) Develop insights about the existing environment or context (including the influence of tribal culture and government) on the strategies developed by each of the tribes; 4) Develop insights about the progress and outcomes of the strategies; 5) Describe partnerships within the tribes, and between tribal and non-tribal (especially Federal) agencies; and 6) Lay the groundwork for the longer-term evaluation. This presentation will focus on lessons learned regarding the participatory evaluation approach from the perspective of the Pueblo of Zuni.

The CIRCLE Project Evaluation: Implementing a Participatory Evaluation in Indian Country from the Perspective of the Oglala Sioux Tribe

Presenter: Paul M Robertson, Oglala Lakota College

Abstract: The CIRCLE Project is a three-year Federal initiative designed to empower American Indian Communities to fight crime, violence and substance abuse more effectively. Its goal is to assist communities in addressing local problems in a comprehensive way through effective planning and appropriate funding. The evaluation is participatory and has been planned and is being managed by the National Institute of Justice with active participation from the CIRCLE project sites and the Federal CIRCLE Project Team. The three CIRCLE Project sites are the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Oglala Sioux Tribe and the Pueblo of Zuni. The goals of the first completed phase of the evaluation were to: 1) Gain insights about the development of the CIRCLE Project and the
three site tribes' specific strategies; 2Track the implementation of the tribal strategies; 3 Develop insights about the existing environment or context (including the influence of tribal culture and government) on the strategies developed by each of the tribes; 4 Develop insights about the progress and outcomes of the strategies; 5 Describe partnerships within the tribes, and between tribal and non-tribal (especially Federal) agencies; and 6 Lay the groundwork for the longer-term evaluation. This presentation will focus on lessons learned regarding the participatory evaluation approach from the perspective of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.
Conference Sessions: Thursday, November 7, 2002 – 11:25 am to 12:55 pm

Presidential Strand

Facilitating Effective Systems Change: Underlying Theories for a Real World Application
Panel Session 349 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Chair: Ernie J. Hill, Center for Prevention Research and Development
The proposed panel presentation will focus on the literature related to interorganizational processes and the mechanisms by which effective systems level changes occur. In particular, the presenters will highlight the conditions that promote effective interorganizational efforts and what it takes to effect systems level changes. Multiple levels of systems will be explored: federal systems, statewide systems, and local systems. The presenters are each from an evaluation team currently engaged in an effort known as the Illinois After School Initiative. The work on this initiative will be used to highlight and demonstrate how the theoretical underpinnings guide the work as well as how the theory is operationalized in a challenging 'real world' setting.

Theories of Systems Change & Overview of the Illinois After School Initiative
Presenter: Angela Adan Farnham, University of Illinois
Abstract: In this presentation, the underlying theories of how systems level changes occur, the mechanisms by which these changes occur, and the conditions conducive to ensuring that the desired changes occur. In addition, the Illinois After School Initiative, which serves as a case study for this presentation, is described in detail. The background of the initiative, the players involved, and the infrastructure put in place to guide the work of this collaborative group. In addition, the work of the contracted evaluators will be outlined, including the ways in which the levels of need for after school programming are assessed throughout the state, as well as the existence of after school resources.

Reciprocal Impacts of System on Evaluation and Evaluation on System
Presenter: Kay Erwin Mulhall, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Abstract: In this section of the presentation, the ways in which the system (federal, state, local) impacted the work of the evaluation team will be discussed. Conversely, the impact of the evaluation on the system as it was being implemented will be highlighted. The challenges encountered will be presented as well as ways in which these challenges were handled. The most notable of the challenges was the time-limited nature of the initiative's work within one of the ultimate goals being a report to the legislature within a 6 to 9 month time frame. The factors that strengthened the evaluators work will also be reviewed, including the high visibility of the initiative and the high level positions held by key stakeholders. Strengths and challenges will be related to the theoretical mechanisms and conditions described in the first presentation.

The Impact of Evaluation Results on a Statewide System of After School Programming
Presenter: Ernie J. Hill, Center for Prevention Research and Development
Abstract: In this presentation, the ways in which the results were utilized by the system will be described at multiple levels. Did the results have the intended impact? How were the results interpreted? How were the results utilized? What did the evaluators do to ensure that the results were meaningful and were used appropriately by all stakeholders? The presentation will conclude with a summary of how the evaluators' experiences on the Illinois After School Initiative relates to the literature on interorganizational efforts and systems change.

Conference Committee Strand

AEA Town Meeting: Review of the Guiding Principles for Evaluators
Think Tank Session 354 to be held in Ballroom F
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Facilitator: Doris L Redfield, Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc
Presenters: Deborah G Bonnet, Lumina Foundation for Education
Ernie House, University of Colorado at Boulder
Anna Madison, University of Massachusetts at Boston
Katherine Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Session Abstract: The focal question is, ‘How does your Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) experience contribute to the definitions, framework and model of ECB presented in the recent New Directions volume on this theme?’ Contributions by ECB practitioners are needed to enrich the conceptualization, professional practice and evaluation of ECB work, in all settings, by both insiders and outsiders to those settings. This is a call for such experience and thus an effort to continue the development of ECB practice and theory. Subgroups will be formed by first selecting those with ECB experience and then dividing by
organizational setting, if there are sufficient participants. Each subgroup will be asked to focus on the same focal question. Members in each will be asked to share in detail how they went about ECB and how this experience contributes to the ideas presented in the volume. For evaluation to become in fact ‘a systematic process that reforms systems’, there must be a viable ECB process which supports the carrying out of evaluation studies and the regular use of evaluation findings: without ECB, no system reform.

### TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions

**The Art, Science and Craft of Evaluation Capacity Building: Conversations to Enhance the Recent New Directions Volume**

Think Tank Session 350 to be held in Ballroom B  
Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG

Chair: Michael Baizerman, University of Minnesota  
Discussant: Conrad G Katzenmeyer, National Science Foundation  
Facilitators: Stacey Hueftle Stockdill, EnSearch  
Keith MacKay, The World Bank  
Don W Compton, American Cancer Society  
Jean A King, University of Minnesota  
Thomas J Chapel, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Session Abstract: The focal question is, ‘How does your Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) experience contribute to the definitions, framework and model of ECB presented in the recent New Directions volume on this theme?’ Contributions by ECB practitioners are needed to enrich the conceptualization, professional practice and evaluation of ECB work, in all settings, by both insiders and outsiders to those settings. This is a call for such experience and thus an effort to continue the development of ECB practice and theory. Subgroups will be formed by first selecting those with ECB experience and then dividing by organizational setting, if there are sufficient participants. Each subgroup will be asked to focus on the same focal question. Members in each will be asked to share in detail how they went about ECB and how this experience contributes to the ideas presented in the volume. For evaluation to become in fact ‘a systematic process that reforms systems’, there must be a viable ECB process which supports the carrying out of evaluation studies and the regular use of evaluation findings: without ECB, no system reform.

**The Contextual Elements of Narrative and Power in Practice**

MultiPaper Session 351 to be held in Ballroom C  
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG

Chair: Leslie Goodyear, City Year  
Discussant: Leslie Goodyear, City Year

**Understanding Changes in Sense of Self in a Leadership Development Program: The Narrative Assessment Interview**

Presenters: Eric E McCollum, Virginia Tech University  
Jamie L Callahan, Texas A&M University

Abstract: One challenge in evaluating programs such as a leadership development program is assessing the changes such programs produce in participants’ sense of self. While such programs may involve skill-building and educational components, many also aim at helping participants come to see themselves as leaders – a change in self-definition. In evaluating one such program, we have adapted to a corporate setting a semi-structured interview protocol (the Narrative Assessment Interview or NAI) developed to assess changes in self-image and understanding in psychotherapy clients. We will illustrate the use of this technique by reporting preliminary data from the evaluation process in which we have used it. This technique promises to help evaluators assess the less tangible and “unintended” changes produced by organizational change efforts.

**The Politics of Program Narrative**

Presenter: Cheryl MacNeil, Cheryl MacNeil Consulting

Abstract: Evaluation can influence systems reform by attending to the politics of program narrative. Specifically, deliberative democratic evaluation offers much promise in assisting stakeholders to critically analyze and collectively re-author the master narrative that is best suited to meeting the needs of their program community. This presents a number of novel challenges and opportunities to evaluators including taking notice of: a) how the dominant plot has been scripted and sustained in fields of power, b) the relational nature of individual and group narratives, c) the influence of professional acumen, language and
labeling practices, d) the authority of role identity, d) the responsibilities of evaluative re-presentation, and e) the economy of knowledge production. I will suggest that evaluation activity that centers attention on the politics of narrative can be useful in balancing information production directed towards the development of positive social capital with evaluation activity oriented toward economic privilege.

Evaluation Use TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Current Thinking and Research on Evaluation Use

Business Meeting Session 352 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG

TIG Leaders
Valerie J Caracelli, US General Accounting Office
Susan A Tucker, Evaluation & Development Associates
Carolyn Huie Hofstetter, University of California at Berkeley

Session Chair
Valerie J Caracelli, US General Accounting Office

Discussants
J ohn M Owen, The University of Melbourne
Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Masafumi Nagao, Hiroshima University

Session Abstract
This session will provide an opportunity to report on recently initiated projects that focus on the topic of evaluation use. The session will provide an opportunity for knowledge sharing and feedback in the spirit of a community of practice. J ohn Owen, University of Melbourne, will give an overview of his experiences at the Centre for International Cooperation in Education in Japan. There he is assisting Masafumi Nagao initiate graduate teaching in evaluation in universities, as well as, leading an effort to create a J apan Evaluation Society. Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico, will describe her recent work on the topic of process use. Both presenters, among others, will encourage dialog among Evaluation Use TIG attendees who may bring to the meeting their own actual or proposed evaluation use research agendas to share with others.

The Enron Scandal: Independent Consultants as Evaluators?

Panel Session 353 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG and the Business and Industry TIG

Chair
Christina Olenik Lynch, Partners in Evaluation & Planning

Presenters
Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates
Michael Hendricks, Independent Consultant
J ohn Seeley, Formative Evaluation Research Associates

Session Abstract
Three experts in the field of evaluation will share their experience and insights as independent consultants. Many of their comments will address the issues highlighted by the recent Enron scandal. The panelists will discuss the history and trends in independent consulting; the issues of public trust and accountability; and independent consultants as credible evaluators. Specific topics to be addressed are: 1) What is the value added that independent consultants bring to the field of evaluation? 2) Does the public response to recent misuses of accountability efforts affect us as evaluation professionals? 3) What are the pros and cons of outcome focused evaluation efforts? 4) Can independent consultants really produce credible evaluations from an objective perspective knowing that their livelihood depends on it? Following a brief presentation by the three panelists, they will engage with the audience in an extensive, highly interactive discussion.

Assessing the Quality of Teaching in Higher Education: Issues of Validity and Quality from a Paradigm Perspective

Panel Session 355 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG

Chair
Robert E Stake, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Discussant
Katherine Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Session Abstract
This panel discussion brings together educational researchers from Mexico, Canada and the US for the purpose of discussing some of the most critical issues on the evaluation of teaching in higher education from different paradigmatic orientations (Positivistic, Cultural-Contextual, and Interpretive). Panel members will discuss how the different theoretic orientations define and evaluate the construct 'teaching quality,' examine the complexities of the context in which the evaluation is conducted, and determine the validity of their claims when making decisions about teaching quality. The
presenters will also analyze possible implications for evaluation use and the consequences that could negatively impact the quality of teaching in the higher education. Finally, they will rely in evaluation research to discuss the consequences that take place when evaluation approaches influence the evaluation of teaching in another county and culture.

**Validity of Representation and Consequential Validity of Current Evaluations of College Teaching: An Interpretive Perspective**

Presenters: Edith J Cisneros-Cohenour, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán  
Robert E Stake, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Abstract: This paper will focus on the interpretive paradigm. The authors will use a qualitative study to illustrate the way in which this paradigm defines quality, validity and address issues about the consequences of the evaluation, especially in the case of women and minority faculty members, as well as in the case of instructors teaching Non-Western required courses to undergraduate students.

**A Positivistic Orientation for Assessing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education**

Presenters: Jennifer Franklin, California State University at Dominguez Hills  
Michael Theall, Independent Consultant

Abstract: The authors will provide an overview of the main findings of the research on the evaluation of teaching using a Positivistic paradigm of inquiry, its challenges and accomplishments.

**A Cultural-contextual Orientation for Assessing the Validity of Current Evaluations of College Teaching: The Use of Evaluation Instruments to Assess the Quality of Teaching in Other Countries and Cultural Contexts**

Presenter: Dan Pratt, University of British Columbia

Abstract: This presentation will examine the use of Western evaluation procedures in other cultural contexts as different as China and Mexico. The paper will address issues of validity and quality as well as the consequences for faculty careers and the system as a whole.

**A Cultural-contextual Orientation for Assessing the Validity of Current Evaluations of College Teaching: Issues of Race, Gender and Ethnicity**

Presenter: Jamie-Lynn Magnusson, University of Toronto

Abstract: This paper will focus on important issues not addressed for the research on the evaluation of teaching in higher education using a theoretical perspective. It will also focus on the limitations and problems of using a psychometric approach for understanding and assessing the complexities of teaching in higher education.

---

**International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation Panel**

Panel Session 356 to be held in the Washington B room  
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG  
Chair: Craig Russon, WK Kellogg Foundation  
Arnold Love, Independent Consultant  
Discussant: Ricardo Millett, The Woods Fund  
Presenters: Donna M Mertens, Gallaudet University  
Gwen Keith, Catholic Education Centre  
Mahesh Patel, UNICEF  
Alexey Kuzmin, International Program Evaluation Network

Session Abstract: This session will provide a forum to report to the AEA membership on the most recent international developments in the evaluation profession including the effort to create an International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation.

---

**Evaluating K-12 Professional Development**

MultiPaper Session 357 to be held in the Potomac I room  
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG  
Chair: Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant

**Capturing Hard-to-capture Data: In Support of an Intensive Professional Development Program and Its Evaluation**

Presenter: Kathryn EH Race, Teacher’s Academy for Mathematics and Science

Abstract: In support of an intensive professional development program for elementary school teachers in Chicago and Illinois, and its evaluation, the methodology used to capture hard-to-capture data obtained in the field are highlighted. Using a standardized form, data are collected electronically by
professional development staff. Specific instructions, operational definition of terms, and a schedule to periodically merge these data into an organizational-wide data depository support this process. Data from this process can range from 1,000 to 1,700 classroom-conference visits for each year of the program. The systematic collection, storage, and the extraction and analysis of this information for routine data queries and in-depth analyses are discussed. Data from a cohort of teachers are used to illustrate this process and underscore how these data can be used to answer program-related questions and can be tied to teacher-related program outcomes. The organizational infrastructure needed to support this effort is noted also.

**Broadening The Way We Evaluate Teacher Professional Development**

**Presenters**  
Roger J. Chesswas, WestEd  
Jodie Stout, WestEd

**Abstract**  
The primary focus of this paper is to use an evaluation study to begin to look at the key outcomes in the evaluation of professional development of school teachers. The outcomes and impact of teacher professional development are typically about the impact on student test scores. This paper will look at how an evaluation of a professional development programme designed to foster and build professional collaborative communities in schools attempts to assess teacher learning, application of learning, and his impact on teaching practices and student learning. In this sense, the evaluation attempts to examine closely the "logic" of teacher professional development that includes what teachers learn, how they use what they learn, and how this impact teaching and learning. The study conducted on a two-year professional development programme for nationally recognized and honored teachers will provide the evaluation approach, methods, and results for this paper.

**Coaching as School-based Professional Development: A First-year Evaluation Report**

**Presenters**  
Noelle V. Rivera, Los Angeles Unified School District  
James S. Sass, Los Angeles Unified School District

**Abstract**  
Contemporary professional development is undergoing a transformation from off-site training events to an everyday, job-embedded process. Within this context, coaching—the provision of demonstration, feedback, and support from one teacher to another—has become a critical component in ongoing, school-based professional learning. This paper reports the methods and results from a first-year evaluation of coaching in a major urban school district. The paper includes a discussion of different coaching models, a review of research on coaching, an explanation of the different data collection methods used in the evaluation, results on coaching across different instructional contexts, and implications for further study of coaching. The paper's contribution to the field of evaluation includes discussions on the importance of clarifying the multiple meanings of a seemingly common concept and the value of using different research techniques to study a complex phenomenon.

**Evaluating a 3-year Professional Development Program for High School Science Teachers**

**Presenters**  
Eric A. Hagedorn, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee  
Dianne Bowcock, University of Wisconsin at Madison  
Sharon L. Schiegel, University of Wisconsin at Madison  
Tim Herman, Milwaukee School of Engineering  
Michael Patrick, University of Wisconsin at Madison

**Abstract**  
This paper describes the evaluation approaches and findings of a three-year professional development program for high school science teachers funded by an NIH - SEPA grant. We discuss how our evaluation was influenced by a systemic context (a large urban school district) and what the evaluation findings reveal about working within such a system to promote reform. We designed a mixed-method evaluation plan to provide both formative and summative feedback. Qualitative techniques included observations of summer courses, structured and informal interviews, and open ended pre- and post-questionnaires. Quantitative techniques included pre- and post measures of efficacy beliefs for teaching biochemistry and pre- and post measures of participant conceptual change using a concept mapping technique.

**Substance Abuse Treatment and 36-month Outcomes: Three Analyses of the Chicago Target Cities Program**

Panel Session 358 to be held in the Potomac II room  
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG  
Chair Andrea Kopstein, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment

**Session Abstract**  
The Chicago Target Cities model was designed to (a) improve access to substance abuse treatment, (b) maintain satisfaction with the intake process, and (c) improve the extent to which co-occurring or ancillary problems were identified and addressed. The Chicago Target Cities evaluation study, conducted by Chestnut Systems, was later included as a component of the Persistent Effects of Treatment Study (PETS), a family of studies designed to evaluate longitudinal outcomes of drug and alcohol treatment provided by publicly funded programs. The papers presented at this panel each utilize 36-month outcomes from the study, but address very different problems. Orwin et al. uses conditional discriminant analysis to examine effects of treatment and non-
treatment factors on the achievement and maintenance of stable housing. Ginexi et al. uses mixed-effects regression models to examine treatment and non-treatment predictors of short- and long-term labor force participation. Grella et al. uses path analysis to examine gender differences in substance abuse outcomes.

**Transitions Through Homelessness and Factors That Predict Them: Three-year Residential Outcomes in the Chicago Target Cities Sample**

**Abstract**

Substance abuse dependence is a documented pathway to job loss, family dissolution, social isolation and, for many, homelessness. However, available evidence suggests that with intensive treatment, in tandem with ancillary supports, homeless clients can achieve and maintain stable housing. The present study analyzes homelessness among adult substance abusers seeking or mandated to treatment in the Chicago Target Cities sample over a 3-year period from 6 months prior to 3 years post entry into the index treatment episode. Descriptive results showed that 73% of initially homeless clients had improved their residential status at 6 months, and 60% were stably housed at 24 months. By contrast, only 28% of clients who were housed prior to intake were no longer stably housed at 6 months, and 25% had not regained stable housing at 24 months. Conditional discriminant analyses were conducted to determine predictors of achievement and maintenance of stable housing. Factors discriminating homeless and housed clients at baseline were consistent with prior literature. Several treatment and non-treatment factors predicted 6- and 24-month housing outcomes in the conditional discriminant analyses models, although the significance and direction of effect estimates varied across conditions. Results based on extension of the model to 36 months will also be presented.

**Predictors of Short- and Long-term Labor Force Participation Following Publicly Funded Substance Abuse Treatment**

**Abstract**

Labor force participation over the course of 3 years was assessed among 1,058 clients in substance abuse treatment. Demographics measured at study and a series of time-varying variables were examined as potential predictors. Gains in labor force participation were greatest at 6 months while gains in employment relative to looking for work were greatest at 24 months. Early on, women, clients who were older, reported psychological problems, received public assistance, or who continued treatment or drug use were more likely to be out of the labor force. Clients with less prior treatment, with psychological problems, or continued drug use were less likely to be employed versus looking for work. At 2- and 3-year follow-ups, factors such as living with family and occupational status also played a significant role in predicting labor force participation. But, by far, the greatest barrier to long-term labor force participation and employment was continued drug use.

**Gender Differences in Drug Treatment Outcomes Among Participants in the Chicago Target Cities Study**

**Abstract**

Gender differences in the characteristics of individuals entering drug treatment and their post-treatment substance use were examined among 904 individuals (63% female) admitted into the Chicago Target Cities Project. Path analysis was used to determine the predictors of drug/alcohol use at 6-, 24-, and 36-months following intake at a central referral agency, by developing separate path models for males and females. The path analyses showed that at 6-months following intake, living with someone with an drug/alcohol problem was related to higher rates of drug/alcohol use for women, but not for men. For both men and women, psychological distress was related to higher levels of substance use at the 6-month follow-up, whereas having an improved living situation and participating in 12-step groups were related to lower levels of use at both follow-up points. The findings suggest that, although there are some similarities in the factors related to recovery for both men and women, women are more vulnerable to relapse because of having substance-using partners. Results based on extension of the model to 36 months will also be presented.

**How Are We Doing? District Evaluations of Technology's Impact on Teaching and Learning**

**Demonstration Session 359 to be held in the Potomac III room**

**Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG**

**Facilitator**

Jeff Sun, Sun Associates

**Abstract**

This session will highlight a process useful for district technology, curriculum, and professional development coordinators to formatively evaluate their district’s progress in deploying technology as a tool for teaching and learning. These tools will focus on the systemic impact of technology on
Strengthening Understanding of Program/Policy Impacts

MultiPaper Session 360 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair: George Julnes, Utah State University
Session Abstract: Identifying program and policy impacts, along with the generalizability of those impacts, is perhaps the most central task for many evaluators. Important as this task is, however, evaluations often are conducted without the benefit of design and analysis options that would strengthen our understanding of program and policy impacts. This session will support evaluators in performing this central task by illustrating some of the options available for strengthening impact conclusions and by considering some of the issues that arise when conducting evaluations that make use of these options.

Can Non-experimental Methods Replicate Experimental Results When Disability Recipients Self-select for Training?

Presenters: Larry Orr, Abt Associates Inc
Stephen Bell, The Urban Institute
Robert Kornfield, Abt Associates Inc

Abstract: This study tests the effectiveness of several non-experimental methods for estimating impacts of programs for low-income persons with disabilities by comparing non-experimental impact estimates with impact estimates obtained from a rigorous experiment based on random assignment. The U.S. Social Security Administration (SSA) initiated Project NetWork (PNW) in 1991 to test case management and referral approaches to providing rehabilitation and employment services to promote employment among beneficiaries of Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and applicants for and recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for blind and disabled individuals. To allow rigorous evaluation, eligible persons who volunteered for the demonstration were randomly assigned to either a treatment group eligible to receive demonstration services, or a control group who did not receive these services. We use the PNW database to test nine non-experimental techniques that use comparisons of *early* and *late* sample entrants, statistical matching of participants and non-participants, and other frequently suggested methods. This subject is of general interest both because of the continuing interest in finding non-experimental methods that are acceptable substitutes for random assignment and because non-experimental methods will be used to estimate the impacts of new programs for low-income persons with disabilities in both the UK (The New Deal for Disabled People, or NDDP) and the US (Ticket-to-Work).

Place Based Randomization in Evaluation: Rationale and Strategies for Use

Presenter: Robert Boruch, University of Pennsylvania

Abstract: This report will cover efforts to mount place based randomized trials (also called cluster randomized and group randomized trials). In such trials, housing projects, villages, geographic areas, hospitals, schools, or other entities are the units of random allocation and analysis. The author's object is to update AEA members on areas in which such trials have been mounted, the major issues entailed by such trials and their resolution, and the rationale for such trials. The illustrations are taken from work in the US, Uganda, Mexico, Scotland and England, China, and elsewhere.

Interdisciplinary Research using Multilevel Models

Presenter: Robert A Johnson, Independent Consultant

Abstract: Multilevel models make it possible to evaluate factors operating at multiple levels of an organization or social hierarchy and to quantitatively assess contextual effects on program outcomes. This paper uses data from recent research on substance abuse treatment to introduce principles of multilevel analysis. In seeking to explain why some patients fare better than others in treatment, theories developed by biomedical, behavioral, and social scientists have privileged levels of analysis that are germane from the perspectives of academic disciplines. Biomedical researchers have focused on pharmacological properties of drugs; behavioral scientists on patients' psychosocial backgrounds; social scientists on variations in counselors' treatment plans, and in the services provided by clinics, and in the social networks and economic conditions prevailing within families, neighborhoods, and larger communities. Multilevel analysis helps to unify research by showing that variables operating at different levels of analysis do not operate independently.

Program Theory as a Contributor to Understanding Program Impacts

Presenter: Len Bickman, Vanderbilt University

Abstract: Despite the claims of its detractors as an unnecessary luxury, program theory offers evaluators a particularly useful way of understanding program impacts in complex social contexts. In that most evaluations concerned with public policy occur in such complex contexts, most of these evaluations would benefit from the program theory perspective. This presentation will provide some examples where program theory evaluation was
Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives (CCIs) in Low-income and Minority Areas: Lessons from the Front Line

Panel Session 361 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair Arlene B Andrews, University of South Carolina
Discussant Arlene B Andrews, University of South Carolina
Session Abstract Start at the end. Listen to the heart. Never tell the numbers without the story. Mediate power differentials. Let those who judge value walk the walk. There’s more. These are among the maxims emerging from extended practice with CCIs. This panel will share lessons learned while providing participative/empowerment evaluation coaching to four initiatives (92 CCIs) that have action units at the direct service, local partnership, and overall initiative levels. All the initiatives aim to reduce disparities by race and SES, although each has a different focus: building community capacity to respond to child/youth issues; connecting disengaged fathers with their children; alternative educational middle and high school programs; and improving early childhood school readiness. Focus topics include: role clarity and evaluation skill development among various stakeholders; mediating trust, power, and conflict issues; promoting local competence in use of measures; and managing resistance to evaluation as new or revised programs or partnerships are developing.

Success and Struggle: Building and Sustaining Capacity in Youth-oriented CCIs
Presenter Anita G Floyd, University of South Carolina
Abstract For four years, university-based consultants have coached eight community-based partnerships in a multiyear initiative to improve child and family well-being in two states. Funded by a large regional foundation, each partnership chose its own focus (e.g. child abuse prevention, youth development, faith community support for schools, others). As the initiative concludes, the consultants have documented lessons learned about building capacity for program development, evaluation, and community collaboration. Evaluation of the overall initiative is based in triangulated methods: case studies of the partnerships, partnership member surveys, and evaluations of the coaches. This presentation will highlight lessons learned regarding membership (including consumer roles, member turnover, and the cost/benefit of natural social networks), structure (the role of conflict in strengthening partnerships), capacity building (it takes capacity to build capacity), coaching processes, and grant making (what we do well and what we could better).

Building Trust and Managing Mistrust: Steps Toward Sustained Evaluation Capacity in CCIs for Fatherhood Enhancement
Presenter Irene Luckey, University of South Carolina
Abstract This presentation focuses on trust as a major component in working with communities. Participative/empowerment evaluation is less well known than the more traditional method(s) of evaluation. Thus, efforts to build evaluation capacity in community organizations and coalitions can be powerfully influenced by issues of stakeholder trust in the participative/empowerment evaluation process. The issue of trust arises at multiple systems levels and in various aspects of community work. The context for lessons learned about trust is a comprehensive statewide Fatherhood Initiative that aims to reconnect low-income noncustodial fathers with their children through community collaboratives in eighteen sites. Specific trust issues for discussion relate to the various stakeholders, i.e. funders and community collaborative partners, funders and university consultants, community and university, various community partners with each other, and community partners and consumers. The nonlinear patterns of trust/distrust will be identified and strategies used to effectively address the issues will be presented.

Building Capacity for CCIs to Choose and Use Measures: Overcoming Resistance in After-school Programs
Presenter Patricia S Motes, University of South Carolina
Abstract This presentation will describe a collaborative process that resulted in the use of a common self-concept measure across multiple middle-school after-school programs based in comprehensive community initiatives (Communities in Schools, 16 sites). Program directors were active participants with the evaluation coaches in the selection of the final tool. They choose a tool that could reliably address individual needs of youth and track self-concept changes over time. Once data from the self-concept measures were available to the multiple after-school programs, program directors developed resistance, expressing concerns that the data presented made them responsible for clinical interventions that were beyond the scope of program staff expertise. This presentation will focus on the collaborative strategies of the evaluation coaches and program directors to use the self concept data responsibly and further build program and evaluation capacity.

Making PIEs (Planning-Implementation-Evaluation) for School Readiness CCIs: Problems, Progress, and Lessons Learned
Presenter Paul Flaspohler, University of South Carolina
Abstract  Using empowerment evaluation principles, PIE (Planning-Implementation-Evaluation) is an approach to building evaluation capacity in a statewide, state funded system of comprehensive community initiatives (n=46) targeting school readiness. PIE coaches provide tools and processes to county partnerships for evaluating programs and collaboration/service integration. "Progress" describes the degree and quality to which the evaluation approach has been established. "Problems" discussed are consistent with the "process-product" and "inside-outside" conflicts described by the Aspen Roundtable on CCIs (1997). "Lessons learned" addresses difficulties associated with institutionalizing a "grass roots" approach to evaluation and describes promising practices for evaluating CCIs and school readiness initiatives. Potential applications of PIE tools and processes to participatory action research are described, including the iterative learning process that occurs as a knowledge base is built around what is works to help local people adapting research-based practice programs to community needs.

Evaluating Violence Prevention Programs: Lessons Learned from Two Models of Capacity-building
Panel Session 362 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair  Linda Bowen, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention
Session Abstract  Two funding entities, a private funder and a state agency, each determined their own model for evaluating grantees involved in a broad range of violence prevention efforts. The National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention funded external evaluators to conduct local evaluations of eight communities working towards collaborative solutions to community violence. The eight evaluators also participated in cross-site evaluation activities in order to evaluate the initiative overall. In comparison, the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority formed a partnership with a not-for-profit, the Illinois Center for Violence Prevention, to create the Evaluation Resource Institute (ERI). ERI provides capacity-building services to over fifty IVPA grantees to assist them in individualized self-evaluations. These models warrant comparison as each agency set out with the same multi-pronged mission: to build the capacity of grantees, to use evaluation to improve violence prevention efforts, and to use evaluation to meet accountability requirements.

Promoting Local Ownership of Evaluation in the Context of Nascent Violence Prevention Efforts
Presenter  Marcy Mistrett, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention
Abstract  One challenge to evaluating violence prevention programs is the relative newness of the field itself, so there is not a lengthy history of evaluation in this discipline. Current evaluation methodology is especially limited in its ability to accurately capture community-level outcomes in violence prevention efforts. In both projects described here, the funders had a strong belief in local control over funder-driven evaluation. However, both funders had to continually reassure grantees about this earnestness of their belief in local program staff having power in determining the role and focus of the evaluation of their local site. A tension between the kinds of rigor that matter was also encountered in scientific rigor, an approach whose methods were sometimes too limited to capture impact of these programs, or "authenticity rigor" associated with community ownership of evaluation, which provides information that more accurately reflects the experience of the community but would not withstand scientific scrutiny.

Building Capacity When Accountability Also Matters
Presenter  Mary E Murray, Mary Murray & Associates
Abstract  Each evaluation model existed within a tension between fulfilling two distinct missions, building capacity of grantees and fulfilling accountability requirements. Each funder saw the importance of building the capacity of grantees to implement effective violence prevention programs, and viewed evaluation as an inherent part of effective programming. However, capacity-building models each required time to fully implement, thus delaying the speed with which solid outcome results that respond to questions about the efficacy of funding efforts could be obtained. This discussion will also address lessons learned regarding organizational readiness for capacity-building in evaluation. Specifically, the capacity-building models were more effective with certain organizations than others. Characteristics of those organizations most positively impacted by these models will be discussed, and implications for use of these models will be shared.

The Nuts and Bolts of Building Capacity of Grantees to Evaluate
Presenter  Heather Barton-Villagrana, Illinois Center for Violence Prevention
Abstract  Both projects described here viewed evaluation as a means to building the capacity of the local community to engage in more effective violence prevention efforts. To achieve this, evaluators need methodological competence as well as a professional philosophy that emphasizes the empowerment of community members and focuses on utilization of evaluation information. However, the successful implementation of an empowerment evaluation approach requires a great deal of trust between evaluators and community members. Therefore, another lesson learned in these projects was that building capacity has a strong relational aspect and that funders can serve as a bridging mechanism to foster trust between evaluators and community members. This presentation will also discuss the costs associated with each model of evaluation and the choices that were made to maximize the evaluation work that could be done within a limited budget.
Considerations for Funders of Violence Prevention and Its Evaluation

Presenter: Linda Bowen, National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention

Abstract: Funders need to take a leadership role in bridging the gap between evaluation and practice. Each of these evaluation endeavors was designed explicitly to facilitate technology transfer, both from evaluators to practitioners and from practitioners to evaluators. However, this required patience and diligence on the part of each funder to ensure that information was exchanged in both directions, and that the learning continued over time. This discussion will address the implications of the many lessons learned for funders, and the responsibility for funders given the state of the field of evaluation of violence prevention efforts.

Strategic Evaluation: An Imperative in Today's Organizations

Panel Session 363 to be held in the Conference Theater room

Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG

Chair: Jennifer W Martineau, Center for Creative Leadership

Session Abstract: “Strategic evaluation” is fully integrated within business processes whereby the process is examined with regard to predetermined goals for strategic outcomes. Thus, business decisions are data-driven — using information that has been collected specifically to determine the effectiveness of a particular business process in meeting its strategic goals. The trouble is, the field of strategic evaluation in business is relatively new, and many organizations are hesitant to dedicate resources into evaluation when “the business process should be effective if we’ve designed it right.” Helping organizations understand the importance and power of incorporating strategic evaluation into business processes is the goal of this presentation, by highlighting four strategic evaluation projects and their associated outcomes.

How, What and So What? Work to Inform Now What?: Strategic Evaluation in a Regional Educational Laboratory

Presenter: Jennifer D Dewey, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Abstract: The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that provides research-based expertise, resources, assistance, and professional development opportunities for teachers, administrators, and policymakers. The Lab has recently focused on evaluation for promoting organizational development and planned change in order to leverage and expand products and services, build staff skills and expertise, and better fulfill the needs of our region. Measurement of breadth and depth of impact, input from our Board of Directors, external evaluation by an expert panel, and contracted evaluation work inform us on how individual initiatives from across and within departments converge around a common goal or thematic approach and relate to the Lab’s overarching mission and vision. Knowing the cumulative impact of the Lab’s work helps us to determine the products, programs, and strategic partnerships that yield the highest ratio of benefits to resources expended, serving to guide our decisions about future investments.

The Impact of Strategic Evaluation on a Leadership and Organizational Development Initiative

Presenter: Jennifer W Martineau, Center for Creative Leadership

Abstract: This case study describes the use of strategic evaluation (both as a formative and summative process) in a 5-year leadership development (LD) initiative within a single organization. This organization functions in a highly politicized environment, making all decisions subject to investigation by the media, the public, and the organization’s governing bodies. The decisions made by the organization have significant implications for its employees and its customers, and need to be made at the lowest level possible. The LD initiative was designed to build leadership capacity at these lowest levels. The strategic evaluation for this initiative was designed in an integrated manner with the initiative itself. The evaluation resulted in significant organizational changes, such as the assignment of senior leaders to work with each team during its work planning session, as a way of addressing the lack of communication between individual sites and the executive level.

Strategic evaluation: Communications System Case Study

Presenter: Scott A Robbins, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Abstract: One type of evaluation that is particularly well suited to strategic planning is the evaluation of organizational communication systems. Results from organizational communication evaluations can be used to install or change communication mechanisms that support essential functions and operations. This case study demonstrates how one organization used the results of a communication evaluation for this purpose. The key evaluation questions focused upon employee satisfaction with current communication practices and ideas for changes that would facilitate organizational performance. The evaluation yielded recommendations related to four different aspects of communication. First were recommendations pertaining to the dissemination of specific types of information (organizational plans, management expectations etc.). Second were recommendations relating to the installation of new communication mechanisms (management “walk-arounds,” organizational web page, shared databases etc.). The third area of concern was related to management attention and responsiveness. The fourth area was related to improvements in the ways meetings were conducted within the organization.
A Systems-level Approach to Manage Change in Organizations Through the Use of Different Performance Management Tools and Techniques

Presenter: Geraldina V Quezada, Western Michigan University

Abstract: Measuring and managing performance is a challenging enterprise and one of the keys to managing change and gaining competitive advantage in organizations. Performance management systems serve strategic, administrative, and developmental purposes; therefore their importance cannot be overestimated. The primary purpose of this research paper is first to describe a systems-level approach to utilize different performance management tools and techniques through the use of balanced and performance scorecards, and then to understand the value of scorecards as a new strategic management system that aid organizations to achieve long-term strategic objectives by communicating strategy and linking it to unit and individual goals. Balanced and performance scorecards are a powerful tool for organizational evaluation by providing managers with information about what performance is required at the organization, process, and job/performer level, what performance to measure, what questions to ask about performance deviations, and what actions to take to modify performance.

Roundtables: Education I

Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 12:10 pm.

Roundtables Session 364 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair: William E Bickel, University of Pittsburgh

First Rotation – Table A: Evaluation of Adventure-based Training Programs for Adult Learners

Presenter: Jean Mee, Southern Connecticut State University

Abstract: The study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of adventure-based training programs for adult learners. Research addressed the utilization of adult learning principles and effectiveness of adventure-based training programs for adult learners in meeting the learning needs of participants, identification of and determining the effectiveness in meeting the goals of adventure-based training programs, and appropriate methodology for evaluating adventure-based programs for adults. Survey research methodology techniques were used to survey adventure-based program participants in order to explore attitudes and perceptions of adult learners about themselves as learners in the adventure setting, and the effectiveness of the program in which they participated. Interviews were used to explore program planners' and participant leaders' perceptions of the goals and expected outcomes, as well as the effectiveness, of adventure programs. Procedures included review of program documents, survey of program participants, interviews with program planners and participant leaders, and observation of programs. The literature review explored adventure-based training programs, history and emergence of adventure education, facilitation and processing of adventure experiences, adult learning, experiential learning, and approaches to program evaluation. Several recommendations are made regarding systematic evaluation of adventure-based training programs for adult learners.

First Rotation – Table B: Continuous Assessment and Monitoring Systems (CAMS): Quality in a Graduate Program Through Automated and Scaled Data Collection

Presenter: Marcie J Bober, San Diego State University

Abstract: When fully developed, the Continuous Assessment and Monitoring Systems (CAMS) will assist faculty in San Diego State UniversityÆs College of Education to conduct a broad range of self-assessment activities. The system is not meant to measure competency but it can interface with pertinent college and/or university systems that track such information. We argue that CAMS has the potential to be the vehicle by which the SDSU College of Education can periodically determine that its several programs Æ are NCATE-compliant: on course, stringent, market responsive, conforming to all state laws and regulations, and motivational.

First Rotation – Table C: Charter Schools and Charter Renewal: State University of New YorkÆs (SUNY) Focus on Academic Performance and Accountability

Presenter: Michael J Stevens, State University of New York

Abstract: Charter schools have a unique contract in the K-12 public school arena; decreased regulation in return for increased student academic performance accountability. Since 1998 The State University of New York (SUNY) has been one of three charter school authorizers in New York State and schools chartered in 1998 will soon be facing their first charter renewal process. This roundtable discussion will highlight SUNYÆs newly developed charter renewal process that answers the accountability question "how good is good enough?" for public school charter renewal.

First Rotation – Table D: Local Relevance in Educational Technology Evaluation

Presenters: Katherine McMillan Culp, Education Development Center
Margaret Honey, Education Development Center
Robert Spielvogel, Education Development Center

Abstract: This presentation reviews a perspective on evaluation of educational technology that emphasizes the importance of locally valid and locally useful research designs. This perspective builds on our organization’s experiences over twenty years of investigating how technologies are integrated...
into educational environments. This evaluation perspective is focused on understanding how schools, school districts, and state and national educational authorities move through the process of investing in and implementing educational technologies. We argue that effective evaluation must produce both research-based knowledge of what technological applications can work best in educational environments, and practice-based knowledge of how the technology integration process can best be designed to meet locally defined learning goals in schools. We also outline how a network of intermediary organizations could work to review, synthesize and generalize from locally-generated evaluation studies, producing broad-based findings that could guide large-scale policymaking.

First Rotation – Table E: Tracking Graduates from a School of Medicine: A Systemic Process Supporting Evaluation Capacity

Presenters: Summers Kalishman, University of New Mexico
Jan Mines, University of New Mexico
Lisa Serna, University of New Mexico

Abstract: Simple, systemic structures for evaluation can provide widely used, and important information to multiple stakeholders. Through a combination of serendipity and diligence, an incrementally developed database of graduates from a school of medicine with limited, accurate information has evolved into a database used by multiple stakeholders. The information is used to address key questions from funders, from legislators, and from researchers. This structure that offers capacity for evaluation and supports investigation of targeted research, has been adapted to meet additional needs of stakeholders. With limited intrusion on participants, the database is updated annually.

First Rotation – Table F: A Theory-based Evaluation of a Voluntary, Multi-site School Improvement Program

Presenters: Sarah E Peterson, Duquesne University
Beth A Whipple, Duquesne University

Abstract: This paper reports on Phase 2 of an evaluation designed to examine a two-year program for teachers in 10 urban and suburban high schools and middle schools in the mid-Atlantic region. The program is offered by a non-profit consortium of educators and is designed to build leadership skills among teachers in order to bring about capacity for change in their schools. A theory of action was developed in the first phase of the evaluation in order to drive ongoing program activities and evaluation efforts. Phase 2 is an evaluation of program implementation and short-term impact. Participants in the program were surveyed and interviewed, documents were reviewed, and program activities were monitored to address evaluation questions identified in Phase 1. The paper will report results of this phase of the evaluation, as well as provide reflections on use of the theory of action to drive ongoing program activities and evaluation efforts.

First Rotation – Table G: Implementing New European Evaluation Standards in Higher Education: The Case of the Music Teacher Education Syllabus at the University of Granada

Presenter: José-Luis Aróstegui, University of Granada

Abstract: Evaluation in European Union public universities is becoming an emerging issue in these days. The implementation of Maastricht Treatment—which implies the eradication of borders among countries in many aspects—and the increase in private universities evoke the implementation of evaluative procedures. In this proposal I will discuss these influences on evaluation of the Music Teacher Education Syllabus at the University of Granada. This evaluation is promoted by the Council of Universities of Spain, as well as by the University of Granada itself. I will discuss some characteristics of the evaluative process, the main data collected, and suggestions that have been raised in order to improve the quality of this syllabus.

My discussion of this evaluation process will be concerned both with the evaluation of this syllabus, and illustration of the evaluation process which is being implemented among Spanish and European universities.

Second Rotation – Table A: A Meta-evaluation of Web-site Evaluation Tools

Presenters: Debbie J Hu, Syracuse University
Patrick Serumola, Syracuse University

Abstract: There are many website evaluation tools available for academic use. The purpose of this presentation will be to provide K-12 educators with a multi-dimensional framework to choose the most appropriate evaluation tool to evaluate educational and informational websites.

Second Rotation – Table B: The Seniors for Schools Initiative Empowerment Evaluation: Building Skills, Strengthening Evaluation, and Informing Change

Presenters: Nicole C Vicinanza, Aguirre International
Carol Hafford, Corporation for National and Community Service
Ken Terao, Aguirre International
John Keller, Corporation for National and Community Service

Abstract: The Seniors for Schools (SFS) initiative of the Corporation for National and Community Service's Senior Corps was launched in the fall
of 1997 to recruit adults over age fifty-five, having the time, talent, experience, and resources to help children read independently by the end of the third grade. Throughout the initiative, special emphasis was placed on fostering the initiative member’s ability to demonstrate that the service activities of the Seniors directly affected student outcomes, especially those related to reading and literacy. The nine SFS sites received technical assistance in evaluation and, with support from an evaluation coach, conducted annual objectives based internal outcome evaluation. This roundtable will show the changes in the ability of the initiative sites in conducting evaluation over four years of the initiative, and talk about the ways in which the evaluation process has effected the initiative, how initiative development effected evaluation, and how the initiative impacted children.

Second Rotation – Table C: Evaluating Educational Programs: Appropriate Versus Prescribed Designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Cheryl G Vrooman, SERVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>The No Child Left Behind Act requires that funded activities reflect scientifically based research. Discussing such research, representatives of the U.S. Department of Education use terms such as &quot;experimental design,&quot; &quot;control group,&quot; &quot;causation,&quot; and &quot;generalization.&quot; A discussion of internal and external validity will provide evidence illuminating the conflict between the directives regarding educational program research and evaluation and designs appropriate for such endeavors. The challenges to researchers and evaluators inherent to these directives become obvious with an understanding of the laws of probability as they relate to the basic requirements of experimental design (i.e., random assignment allowing causal inference and random selection allowing inference, or generalization, to a population). Such challenges, however, can be addressed effectively. A discussion of appropriate research and evaluation designs for education programs will support optimistic views for the future of educational research and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Rotation – Table D: The School Assessment Center: A More Holistic Approach to the Evaluation of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
<th>Rebecca Bardwell, Marquette University, Kate Kaiser, Marquette University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>The school Assessment Center provides the materials, technology and personnel for schools to use when developing the tools they need to effectively evaluate not only the products of education, student learning, but also the processes of education which lead to more effective learning. These evaluation tools are intended to improve educational practice through more effective and ongoing assessment and through the integration of information technology. The goal is for schools to make data driven decisions in ways that have been common in other sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Rotation – Table E: Evaluating Federal Initiatives: A Local Evaluator’s Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Susan P Giancola, University of Delaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>This roundtable discussion will relate to the role of the local evaluator in the evaluation of federal initiatives. The facilitator will present several models of the role of evaluation in federal programs, with a particular emphasis on programs in the field of education. Traditional roles will be contrasted with emerging roles and the function of the Campbell Collaboration’s education group will be discussed in relation to these roles (the Campbell Collaboration is an international organization committed to the preparation of high quality systematic reviews of rigorous research on social programs). Roundtable participants will have the opportunity to discuss the role and rigor of evaluation in federal initiatives, as well as the responsibility of evaluators to develop and promote this role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Rotation – Table F: Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
<th>L Dee Torre, MGT of America Inc, Nina Brown Barrios, MGT of America Inc, Pamela Rios, Maryland State Department of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>MGT of America, Inc. has conducted a two year evaluation of the Reading Excellence Act in the State of Maryland. The evaluation provides insight into gathering uniform data in diverse school districts and discusses a broad range of implementation issues, best practices and evaluation strategies to assess REA initiatives. The presentation will include commentary from the Maryland Department of Education project administrator about lessons learned and next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Rotation – Table G: Evaluating an After School Initiative: Correlating Program Capacity with Youth Outcomes

|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Abstract        | Although proliferating, after school programs have not typically been rigorously evaluated. For this reason, The Colorado Trust is funding an evaluation of 35 After School programs across the state of Colorado. Each program is tracking its services using software called KidTrax, which collects detailed program participation data. These data will be connected to youth outcome data to determine program effects. Additionally, grantees are receiving technical assistance in culturally competent programing, developing partnerships with parents and the community, positive youth development frameworks, evaluation and program sustainability. Grantees’ capacity in each of these elements will be assessed over the five-year initiative to determine if
programs with high levels of competency in these elements demonstrate stronger youth outcomes than programs with low competency. The session will discuss how to ensure the success of large-scale evaluation, the data collected thus far and the importance of the correlating grantee capacity with positive youth outcomes.

Indigenous Ways of Knowing and Evaluation
Panel Session 365 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair Jane Grover, RMC Research Corporation
Discussant Joan LaFrance, Mekinak Consulting
Session Abstract Indigenous values tend to emphasize community over the individual. Indigenous cultures also communicate in more visual and oral mediums compared the Western written traditions. How are these differences to be mediated when doing an evaluation whose audience is often a government or foundation based in Western traditions of individual growth and literate communications. This panel will explore how differences in worldview and in communication styles have influenced their approaches to evaluation. The presenters on this panel have worked with Maori in New Zealand, American Indians, Canadian First Nations, and Hmong refugees living in America.

A Canadian First Nations Approach to Evaluation
Presenter Andrea Johnston, Johnston Research Inc
Abstract Evaluation is very much a western concept, but the concept of continual improvement is not foreign to indigenous people. Many First Nations people speak about the four aspects of self and the importance of maintaining balance within one’s self. Using this way of life as a basis, consultations with Elders and Healers are leading to the development of an indigenous approach to evaluation. Utilizing the teaching method of our ancestors, this evaluation model will be communicated to others by means of an audio 3-D animation. While the basis for this model centers on the individual, First Nations people believe that what affects the individual extends to the family, community, and finally the nation. Thus, it is through the continual improvement of the individual that organizations improve. This presentation will describe the dimensions included in this model and elaborate on the benefit of grounding program evaluation in Indigenous knowledge, practices, and traditions.

Treaties and Tradition: Cultural Competence in New Zealand Evaluation
Presenter Hayley M Cavino, Syracuse University
Abstract This paper employs two models to explore culturally appropriate evaluation as it occurs in New Zealand. The first of these – The Treaty of Waitangi – is legislatively mandated as a standards framework for practitioners in a number of helping professions. Its grounding principles: participation, partnership, and protection, also guide the provision of health, education and social services to Maori – the indigenous people of New Zealand. The values model provides an additional framework grounded within the cultural norms and ideals of the Maori people. Using national-level health promotion and youth service examples, the paper illustrates the utility of both models for guiding culturally competent evaluation practice. The paper contends that Indigenous and culturally relevant models can and should be utilized by evaluators working in indigenous contexts. The paper emphasizes the primacy of cultural relevance in the design, implementation, and subsequent data analysis of evaluations that are likely to impact Indigenous peoples.

The Mandala Model: Interfacing Cultural Modeling with Standard Logic Modeling to Build Evaluation Capacity in Hmong Community-based Organizations
Presenters Kalyani Rai, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Pa Vang, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Abstract This presentation discusses how a cultural asset mapping strategy interfaces with outcome evaluation that broadens and deepens logic modeling for evaluation practitioners. It represents an outgrowth of work on the Mandela model as a framework for outcome evaluation. The model was developed to effectively address unique evaluation needs of Hmong refugee community-based agencies. The Mandela model emphasizes evaluation as a product of community tradition, customs, knowledge, beliefs and practices. It is a strategy to interface cultural modeling with standard logic modeling for building the evaluation capacity of refugee communities. This presentation focuses on the problems and prospects of the application of the Mandela model, demonstrating how a focus on process and content in the use of a cultural asset mapping strategy that can provide a framework for implementing effective community outcome evaluation.

International Issues and Approaches in Evaluation of Research and Technology Programs
Panel Session 366 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Evaluation 2002: Thursday, November 7, 11:25 am to 12:55 pm

Panel Session 367 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG

Chair  Bill Valdez, US Department of Energy
Session Abstract  In evaluation of research, technology and development programs it is particularly important to have an international forum for sharing evaluation challenges and approaches. Much more evaluation and communication of value is being required than ever before. These programs are hard to evaluate and communicate, and traditional assessment approaches are inadequate. The system is changing and assessment is responding to those changes. Thus there are many challenges and many emerging approaches. There is only a small community of evaluators working in this area. This forum brings together evaluators from across the world to share information in an interactive format.

Current Issues and Evaluation Approaches in New Zealand
Presenter  Amir Pirich, Ministry of Economic Development
Abstract  After a review of the current and emerging requirements for evaluation and performance measurement in this region of the world, a few new approaches to evaluation will be briefly described. The speaker will be available for questions and the interactive discussion that follows the brief presentation.

Current Issues and Evaluation Approaches in Canada
Presenter  George G Teather, Independent Consultant
Abstract  After a review of the current and emerging requirements for evaluation and performance measurement in this region of the world, a few new approaches to evaluation will be briefly described. The speaker will be available for questions and the interactive discussion that follows the brief presentation.

Current Issues and Evaluation Approaches in Austria and the European Union
Presenter  David FJ Campbell, Institute for Advanced Studies
Abstract  After a review of the current and emerging requirements for evaluation and performance measurement in this region of the world, a few new approaches to evaluation will be briefly described. The speaker will be available for questions and the interactive discussion that follows the brief presentation.

Current Issues and Evaluation Approaches in the United States
Presenter  Bill Valdez, US Department of Energy
Abstract  After a review of the current and emerging requirements for evaluation and performance measurement in this region of the world, a few new approaches to evaluation will be briefly described. The speaker will be available for questions and the interactive discussion that follows the brief presentation.

How Will We Know When It's Done? Using Evaluative Tools to Inform Program Selection and Design: The Case of California Cooperative Extension
Panel Session 367 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG
Chair  Nicki King, University of California at Davis
Discussant  Susan J Barkman, Purdue University
Session Abstract  This session will describe California Cooperative Extension's effort to integrate evaluative practices into the program planning process. Cooperative Extension programs are particularly difficult to change or discontinue because of CE's relationship to and dependence on external audiences, many of whom consider themselves to be stakeholders in the status quo. Some of these audiences see Cooperative Extension as needing to 'advocate' for some of its audiences or for particular modes of program delivery, and are quite vocal and critical when aspects of the traditional program are threatened with change. Other, usually newer programs were developed with evaluation as a "core value" and have aspects of evaluative practice imbedded in their ongoing activity. Changing the institutional culture of an established organization like Cooperative Extension to make it more open to evaluation requires institutional support, administrative encouragement, and thoughtful focus of the evaluative tools to appropriate and meaningful evaluation.

The University of California-Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Program Planning Process: The First Step in Accountable Program Delivery
Presenter  Milton Fujii, University of California
Abstract  Thoughtful, purposive program planning is the necessary starting point for the development of meaningful programs that can be evaluated and changed or discontinued if necessary. The presentation will include descriptions of UC's statewide program planning process for Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension, which integrates planning across the research-extension continuum. We will discuss opportunities and challenges related to identification of program priorities and operationalization of goals in a decentralized and programmatically diverse organizational context.
context, and involvement and “buy-in” of internal and external stakeholders.

**How Can Cooperative Extension Administrators Influence the Conduct and Utilization of Evaluation to Improve Programs?**

**Presenter**      Susan G Laughlin, University of California at Davis

**Abstract**      A regional director can both plead and prod to encourage evaluation of programs. In fact, in California pleading is simply a veiled means of encouraging advisors to do what they must do to maintain healthy careers. Thus, we’re never very far from wielding the proverbial stick that many of our advisors feel the merit and promotion system to be. Our advisors are required to discuss results and impacts of their programs each time they are reviewed for advancement. The committee that recommends advancement is intent upon seeing reasonably credible statements regarding the effect of our programs on clientele. This sounds for all the world like evaluation! Many factors stand in the way of advisors doing what is increasingly expected of them. Some simply don’t know how to conceive and design an evaluation, some are so dedicated to serving their clientele they resent the distraction of collecting data, some are thoroughly convinced of the value of their programs and would not think to question their effectiveness. Regional directors have a sales job to do and “sales” must be accompanied with training, support, incentives, and recognition.

**What Characteristics of the Evaluation Setting Relate to Utilization?**

**Presenter**      Marc Braverman, University of California at Davis

**Abstract**      Program evaluation is highly valued within Extension settings, and new programs or externally funded projects generally contain carefully crafted evaluation plans. However, as is true in most program settings, these evaluations are often underutilized once they are completed. This presentation will discuss factors that can promote or hinder utilization of results. Examples of different kinds of evaluations relating to University of California Cooperative Extension programs will be presented and discussed. In keeping with decision-based models, one important characteristic that emerges is the existence of an immediate decision context. Evaluations that pursue a particular information need stand a greater chance of utilization, while those designed and conducted as a matter of routine are less like to be used. One implication of this perspective is that when evaluations are designed, they should be targeted toward addressing specific topical questions, even at times at the expense of more global questions regarding program effectiveness.

**Using Evaluation Tools and Outcomes to Speed Program Adoption and Change: The Cases of 4-H and Integrated Pest Management (IPM)**

** Presenter**      Nicki King, University of California at Davis

**Abstract**      The 4-H Youth Development Program is one example of mixed success in the implementation and impact of program evaluation. Some of the program activities no longer reflect best agricultural or family development practice, but remain a mainstay of the most visible parts of the 4-H Youth Development Program, such as the Junior Livestock Auction and the 4-H Fashion Revue. California’s 4-H Youth Development Program has had mixed success in modifying practices in the program by utilizing evaluation techniques for program planning and review. In contrast, The Integrated Pest Management Program (IPM) is a prime example of the utilization of evaluative tools and to accelerate adoption of more sustainable agricultural practices, as well as to a change in the policies governing pesticide use in California agriculture. Many factors may account for the different “success rate” of evaluation in promoting change and adoption of new program directions. The paper explores how program planners and evaluators learn from program areas where evaluation has led to positive program changes to speed the adoption of change in other CE program areas.

**Measuring Progress Toward Gender Equity**

MultiPaper Session 368 to be held in the Roosevelt room

Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG

**Chair**      Tristi C Nichols, Manitou Inc

**Discussant**      Tristi C Nichols, Manitou Inc

**Evaluating Priorities for Institutionalization Using Multi-attribute Utility Technology (MAUT) for a Gender Equity Project in the Urban Elementary Schools**

** Presenter**      Gail S Gliner, Metropolitan State College of Denver

**Abstract**      As the granting period of a National Science Foundation project to retain inner city upper elementary girls in mathematics and science is ending, stakeholders are concerned about what aspects of the project to try to institutionalize. Thirty-three stakeholders participated in a MAUT (Multi-Attribute Utility Technology) evaluation. They made numerical judgments comparing aspects (attributes) of the project, and their judgments were combined into a ratio-scale ordering of the attributes. The management team also provided “real world” judgments about the feasibility of maintaining each attribute, and a “composite utility” for each attribute was computed. There were similarities and some glaring differences in the priorities of the management team and the teachers that would not have come to light without the evaluation. The MAUT evaluation provided a forum within which to discuss these differences and move forward in a more collaborative manner to plan for the future, considering everyone’s views in the context of systemic reform.

**Who Learned What? Feminist Reflections on a Monitoring and Evaluation Training Course in Southern Africa**

**Presenter**      Donna R Podems, The Union Institute
Abstract An international donor agency in Southern Africa decided that their project management staff, most of whom were local hires, should have a better understanding of monitoring and evaluation. The donor's intention was for project management staff to improve their local partners' monitoring and evaluation capacity. As a result, an innovative year-long training program that drew on feminist and adult learning theories was designed to meet these needs. The program was more than just a course on monitoring and evaluation; it also addressed project development and encouraged participation in a "safe" setting. Evaluations of the course indicated that it was an effective and successful training. During the training program, an ethnographic study of the participants' experiences revealed an initial change in attitude and confidence in relation to monitoring and evaluation of their projects. However, one year later, follow-up interviews indicated that very little change had occurred in the donor agency. Furthermore, project managers, who had expressed appreciation of their own learning had not transferred their skills and knowledge to their grantees.

Measuring Progress Towards Gender Equality
Presenter Gita Gopal, The World Bank
Abstract The Operations Evaluation Department recently undertook two phased evaluations of the World Bank’s progress in implementing its gender policy, producing two reports, which have been disclosed to the public in 2001. The first evaluation looked inwards and assessed institutional measures for policy implementation, focusing on inputs and outputs. The second more challenging evaluation looked outwards to the client countries to assess the results of Bank assistance, measuring to the extent possible outcomes and impacts on the ground, with the country as the unit of accountability. The speaker, who managed these two tasks for OED, will present the challenges of designing the evaluation, the choices of methodology, the evaluation's weaknesses and strengths, and discuss the costs of the evaluation as well as the impact of the evaluation. Feedback from the session will be used to strengthen the next evaluation -- a Gender Update planned to be initiated in 2004.

Evaluating K-12 Programs that Support Student Learning
MultiPaper Session 369 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Anne M Chamberlain, Success For All Foundation
Abstract It can often be challenging to design methods to assess systemic change in schools that provide comprehensive data, yet are easy to administer. To meet these competing needs, a school survey and an office referral database were created to evaluate a school-wide intervention, the Boys Town Educational Model, which emphasizes classroom management, discipline practices, and social skills instruction. The survey was designed to be an efficient measure of student, teacher and parent perceptions of school change across a variety of content areas. The database was created to allow program staff and schools to easily organize and analyze student discipline data. For example, schools using the database were able to generate reports that illustrated patterns and trends in discipline data on individual and school-wide levels. This presentation will discuss of the development of the surveys and database, preliminary results, and ways to encourage school-level support for assessment activities.

The Joys and Challenges of Florida's Extended School Year Pilot Program: A Systemic Evaluation of Systemic Change in Public Schools
Presenters Constance C Bergquist, Evaluation Systems Design Inc
Marvin Patterson, Florida Department of Education
Abstract As part of a strong commitment to high standards for education, the 2000 Florida Legislature created the three-year Extended School Year Pilot Program. Participating schools in this $11 million dollar program extended the length of the academic year for all students beyond 180 days to 210 days. The Florida Department of Education contracted with Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. to conduct a three-year evaluation of the program. This study examined the curriculum, instructional methods, and strategies employed in the first two years of implementation and the effect on student performance, teachers and school staff, and community and parents. More than 600 educators and 800 parents contributed to the study from the participating 8 school districts and 19 schools. Results included extensive demographics on the participating schools, documentation of early planning and implementation, and examination of student achievement changes in all schools using the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test.

Addressing the Summer Learning Loss: Evaluation of the Rising Stars Program
Presenter Greg J Roberts, University of Texas at Austin
Abstract Recent findings by Alexander & Entwistle (1996) and by Cooper and his colleagues (Cooper et al., 2000) suggest a need for school-
based summer programs that target the summer learning loss of disadvantaged urban school children. Scholars agree that any reform strategy must be
designed with an urban context in mind, must be research-based, and should reflect a systems orientation (Darling-Hammond, 1993; Fullan, 1991); however,
on the details of such an undertaking, there is less consensus and even less research (Borman, 2000). The question remains, "What types of program are
most effective for preventing summer learning loss and closing the achievement gap?" This paper summarizes 3 summersÆ worth of findings from a
continuing evaluation of the Jefferson County, KentuckyÆs Rising Stars Program, which uses a curriculum developed by Voyager Expanded Learning.
Students (n=1,326 over three summers) in Rising Stars made significant gains, on average, in NCE scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Evidence
also suggests that gains were sustained after programs completion, though retention of gains was less robust when considered over time. Long-term data on
outcomes for these students is summarized in this paper.

Evaluating College Preparatory Programs: Alternative Strategies for Examining Program Merit and Worth

Presenters: Rebecca A Zulli, North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network
Sherick A Hughes, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Abstract: Evaluating college preparatory programs poses particular challenges because the ultimate goals of the program relate to outcomes that
coccur after program completion. Additionally, it is difficult to attribute observed outcomes solely to program participation or to quantify the value of the
program to society. This paper presents the strategies used by the Mathematics and Science Education Network (MSEN) Pre-College Program to track
program graduates, estimate the number of graduates that attend college solely on the basis of program participation, and calculate the costs and benefits of
the program based on the estimates of its impact on a sample of high school graduates. In its first year of implementation, the tracking system has proven to
be cost effective and highly viable and beneficial. Additionally, through utilizing appropriate estimation formulas and cost-benefit analysis, the program was
able to offer unique and compelling evidence in support of program merit and worth.

Evaluating HIV Programs

MultiPaper Session 370 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG
Chair: Eunice Rodriguez, Cornell University

Do Participant-driven Recruitment Methods Work in the Evaluation of Sensitive Programs? Results from an HIV Prevention Study in Rural New York State

Presenters: Eunice Rodriguez, Cornell University
Josephine AV Allen, Cornell University
Jennifer S Tiffany, Cornell University

Abstract: Our study presents the results of using Participant-Driven Recruitment/Respondent-Driven Sampling (PDR/RDS) in an HIV prevention
evaluation project among adolescents in rural NY. PDR is a new incentive-driven form of chain referral sampling developed by sociologist Douglas Heckathorn
to obtain unbiased samples while involving members of hidden and stigmatized populations in prevention research efforts. Using baseline data on 62
participants we find that participation rates by young men (53% of sample), residents of small villages/farming communities (42%), and minority youth
(7%) are proportionate to 2000 census data, and higher than obtained in prior studies. RDS analysis on gender, ethnicity and geographical distribution of the
participants indicate that after a few recruitment waves the composition of the RDS sample stabilizes, and can be validated against census data. Our study
confirms that RDS is an excellent tool to be used in the implementation and evaluation of programs among hard to reach populations.

How a Rapid Feedback Evaluation Improved the Recruitment and Retention Rates of an Integrated HIV/AIDS Care Intervention

Presenters: Miles A McNall, The CORE Center
Vincent Welch Jr, National Opinion Research Center
Kari Ruh, Northern Illinois University

Abstract: This paper presents a rapid feedback internal evaluation model and describes how it was used to improve the recruitment and retention
rates of an integrated HIV/AIDS care intervention. The rapid feedback evaluation saved time by drawing on existing data from the project's Management
Information System (MIS). Rapid feedback evaluation cycles were a three-step process, involving 1) analyzing MIS data to identify problematic steps in the
recruitment and retention process, 2) gathering and analyzing additional data on recruitment and retention procedures at the problematic steps, and 3) recommending changes to recruitment and retention procedures. Several rapid feedback cycles were completed, most lasting less than two weeks.
Recommendations were presented orally and in brief one-page reports to the Principal Investigator. The strengths and limitations of a rapid feedback model
as an alternative to more protracted evaluation models will be discussed.

Policy that Changes the Systematic Process of Evaluation: Case Studies of the Saber Es Poder and S.T.A.R.R. Programs in Los Angeles

Presenters: Miguel A Chion, AIDS Project Los Angeles
Abstract
Assessment of sexual risk behavior is a crucial component of formative and process evaluation for HIV prevention programs. Sexual risk behavior information can help to improve existing programs and develop targeted programs. Section 60650 of the California Education Code prohibits programs to ask questions regarding student sexual behaviors. In 1998 upon the request of the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services Office of AIDS Programs and Policy, the Saber Es Poder and STARR program surveys were reviewed by the local school district. As a result of this review, questions related to sexual behaviors were removed. Instead, questions regarding perceptions of risk behavior were collected. The new strategy provides an approximation of other youth sexual practices. Until policy makers recognize the importance of assessing directly youth sexual risk behaviors, school-based HIV prevention programs that work with youth will suffer from limited or no risk assessment data.

Developing and Using Evaluation Information Regarding Programs to Prevent and Treat Juvenile Delinquency in the Context of Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Categorical Assistance and Formula Grants Programs

MultiPaper Session 371 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG
Chair Eric L Peterson, US Department of Justice
Session Abstract A major objective of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is to increase the degree to which programs for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency are based on rigorous evaluations and implemented through empirically supported planning. The contexts in which these evaluations are conducted and plans are developed are complex with activities and funding take place at the Federal, State, and local levels, often in combination. This panel illustrates three different approaches OJJDP takes to developing evaluation information and encouraging its use. The evaluation of the Juvenile Mentoring Program is conducted by an OJJDP grantee in over 200 sites nationally. The second evaluation presenting in this panel has evolved into an assessment of Community Assessment Centers as a national movement. The third presenter will explain a program to build the capacity of state and local organizations to conduct and use evaluations.

The Systemic Impact and Context of the National Evaluation of Community Assessment Centers
Presenter Madeline Wordes, National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Abstract The evaluation of Community Assessment Centers (CAC) for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has had substantial impact on juvenile justice practice across the country. Interestingly, the influence is not mainly due to findings from the outcome evaluation. The impact of the evaluation seems to be due to the burgeoning phenomena of CACs and the lack of available formative information. The evaluators have been the advisors on process issues in jurisdictions around the country. While the field has asked for outcome data, when presented with it, they focus almost solely on process issues. Due to the political and systemic context of the evaluation, the role of the evaluator has been somewhat different than the norm. This paper will discuss how the methods used and presentation of the findings were influenced by the systemic and political context in which this evaluation was conducted.

Evaluation Capacity Building for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Presenter Stan Orchowsky, Justice Research and Statistics Association
Abstract The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) has been working with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) on a project to improve state evaluation systems for juvenile justice programs. The Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (JJEC) provides training, technical assistance and information on evaluation to state and local juvenile justice administrators. OJJDP’s Formula Grants Program mandates the formation of State Advisory Groups (SAGs) that are responsible for project funding and oversight. The JJEC project has been working with these SAGs and state juvenile justice Specialists to develop evaluation models for their state juvenile justice systems, and to develop their capability to use the information they collect from juvenile justice programs for evaluative purposes. This presentation will focus on project efforts to develop evaluation strategies given the diversity of state systems, and how the management of evaluation activities is affected by Federal, state and local priorities and funding strategies.

Evaluating Over 200 Juvenile Mentoring Programs
Presenter: Laurence C Novotney, Information Technology International

Abstract: The Juvenile Mentoring Program was legislated by Congress, regulated by the DOJ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and implemented by more than 200 local community organizations throughout the United States. Each aspect of the national evaluation, including design, data collection, analysis, and reporting, must recognize the systemic context of each of these very different organizational entities. Staff from Information Technology International (ITI), the national evaluator, will discuss methodological issues and evaluation findings that demonstrate both the commonality and differences among the Congress, OJJDP, and individual JUMP projects. ITI also will describe the applicability of this information for other juvenile justice programs.
### Presidential Strand

**AEA Business Meeting**

Business Meeting Session 372 to be held in Ballroom A  
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand  
Facilitators: Nanette Keiser, Western Michigan University, AEA Treasurer  
Molly Engle, Oregon State University, AEA President  
James Sanders, Western Michigan University, AEA Past-president/Secretary

### Special Event

**Open House at the College and University Tables**  
Networking opportunity to be held at the College and University exhibit tables  
Sponsored by the Conference Committee

Representatives will be available at the College and University tables to discuss their institutions and programs. Take this opportunity to connect with students and faculty from Colleges and Universities offering degree, certification, and/or professional development opportunities in the evaluation field.
Abstract

The Conceptual Foundations for Emerging Standards of Good Practice Among Evaluators Working in Culturally Diverse Communities in the United States

Panel Session 379 to be held in Ballroom F
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair Charles L Thomas, George Mason University
Discussant Elmina C Johnson, National Science Foundation
Abstract Session Thomas (2001) proposed six clusters of attributes required for culturally competent evaluations: attributes related to overall study’s theoretical perspective, instrumentation, research/evaluator qualifications, interpretations, and study design. Explication of these attributes may be necessary before worthwhile standards of practice can be advanced in the conduct of program evaluations in culturally specific settings. Using these categories as an organizing framework, the presenters will discuss the theoretical assumptions and empirical basis for criteria for adjudging the relevance of evaluation plans and evaluators’ practices in cross cultural settings. Drawing from theory and empirical evidence, the presenters will address the following questions:
- What do we mean by ‘cultural competence’? Is it a value-added construct for assuring that evaluations are neither irrelevant nor under-represent the judgment claims that are generated? - Guiding Principles vs Standards: Where do diversity guidelines fit? - In the context of program evaluation in the United States, what aspects of culture should be given saliency in considering multicultural competence (e.g., race, ethnicity, class, linguistic diversity)?

Attributes of Culturally Competent Evaluation: An Overview
Presenter Charles L Thomas, George Mason University
Abstract Six categories of attributes for culturally relevant evaluations will be described and their rationale explained. This descriptive framework serves as a point of departure for criticisms and analysis of the issues related to the professional qualifications of evaluators and the tenability of program evaluations conducted in culturally diverse communities in the United States. Six categories of attributes will be described and the

Multicultural Validity and Culturally Relevant Evaluation
Presenter Karen E Kirkhart, Syracuse University
Abstract Dr. Kirkhart will examine the assumptions and theory associated with multicultural validity and its relevance to improving the practice of evaluation in multicultural settings.

Guiding Principles Versus Standards: Where Do Diversity Guidelines Fit?
Presenter William R Shadish, University of Memphis
Abstract The American Evaluation Association has developed a set of guiding principles for evaluators. A number of associations have devised standards for adjudging the quality of work of their professionals. Dr. Shadish will examine the relative value of such normative prescriptions for establishing guidelines for evaluators working in culturally diverse communities.
**Attributes of Culturally Competent Research**

**Presenter**  
Germine H Awad, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

**Abstract**  
Ms Awad will explicate selected attributes viewed to be critical for sound research and evaluation in multicultural settings. Attention will be given to their relevance for devising useful standards of practice.

---

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**The Changing Face of Evaluation Training: A Global View**

Panel Session 375 to be held in Ballroom B  
Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Molly Engle, Oregon State University

**Discussants**  
Masafumi Nagao, Hiroshima University  
Nancy Grudens-Schuck, Iowa State University  
Karyn Hicks, Government of Northwest Territories  
Kaireen Chaytor, Chaytor Consulting Services LTD

**Presenters**  
James W Altschuld, The Ohio State University  
Molly Engle, Oregon State University

**Session Abstract**  
Dramatic changes have occurred in evaluation training since 1992. For the evaluation profession to be a vital and dynamic profession, training is essential, especially for evaluators to work with diverse audiences, to evaluate across various substantive areas, and to maintain the profession at a highly competent level. Additionally, the globalization of economies, societies, and resources, demands that training reach across borders and deal with potentially different needs. To capture the current scope of training we undertook the 2001-2002, AEA-endorsed evaluation training program survey collaborating with the National Science Foundation, Westat, and the Kellogg-funded AEA Diversity Initiative. By recruiting widely, we developed an international sampling frame of university-based and professional development training programs. We inquired as to the audience targeted and the content focus of training efforts. We also inquired as to what introductory opportunities exist in institutions which target traditionally under-served populations. The session presents the findings of the survey.

---

**Linking Performance Measurement and Evaluation with the Policy Process**

Panel Session 376 to be held in Ballroom C  
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG and the Evaluation Use TIG and the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG

**Chair**  
Rakesh Mohan, Washington State Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee

**Discussant**  
Rakesh Mohan, Washington State Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee

**Presenters**  
Joseph S Wholey, University of Southern California  
John M Owen, The University of Melbourne  
Ian Davies, Capacity Development Network  
David J Bernstein, Montgomery County Public Schools

**Session Abstract**  
This interactive panel of evaluation professionals from diverse backgrounds will discuss key issues and challenges about linking performance measurement and evaluation results with the public policy process. Systems cannot be reformed unless the process used to reform is linked with decision-makers. In recent years, there has been an increased focus on performance measurement and evaluation for improving accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness of government programs and services at all levels—federal, state, and local. However, the results of performance measurement and evaluation are not always effectively communicated to people in decision making positions. The challenge for evaluators and evaluation organizations lies in linking the results of their activities with the public policy process, so necessary decisions to reform the systems can be made. Most of the session will be devoted to questions and answers.

---

**Using Data and Management to Inform Systems Change**

MultiPaper Session 377 to be held in Ballroom D  
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG

**Chair**  
Margaret L Polinsky, Parents Anonymous Inc
Evaluating a Community Initiative on Early Childhood: Interim Findings from the Cuyahoga County, Ohio Experience

Presenter: Robert L Fischer, Case Western Reserve University

Abstract: The Cuyahoga County Early Childhood Initiative (ECI) is a unique three-year public/private collaborative effort to improve early intervention and supportive services to children (0-3) in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. The ECI includes several interrelated efforts: home visiting for first-time and teen mothers and intensive service for the most at-risk families, improved child care through certification of home-based providers and training about caring for children with special needs; and expansion of government-subsidized health coverage for children in low-income families. In its first two years the ECI programs have been taken to scale and woven into the fabric of local services. Early indications are that the programs are producing the intended positive measurable changes in the community. The ongoing emphasis of the Initiative is to continue to enhance the quality of those services, assess how they could be improved, and increase public awareness of the Initiative.

Using Data Management Systems to Facilitate Evaluation Capacity: A Human Services Example

Presenter: Gavin C Lemieux, University of Minnesota

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to present the procedures and lessons learned from developing an information system to facilitate internal evaluation. The paper uses the author's experience with Focus Beyond, a St. Paul, MN, Human Service agency serving the transition needs of youth with disabilities. The process developed for Focus Beyond is unique as it integrates information systems theories with evaluation theories such as collaborative and scientific realist evaluation approaches. Lessons learned include the struggle to balance state and federal accountability systems with local service delivery contexts, the need to develop training protocols to ensure continued systemic data use (as opposed to episodic data use) and changes in the service delivery system as a result of the data management system. Evidence of success and challenges in increasing evaluation capacity through this data tool are derived from the testimonial evidence of program management, social workers and case managers.

Parent Leadership: Design Issues in the Evaluation of Systems Change in Six California Counties

Presenter: Margaret L Polinsky, Parents Anonymous Inc

Abstract: This paper discusses the design and implementation of an evaluation for a three-year project which had a goal of strengthening the California Child Welfare system by promoting and implementing Parent Leadership as a critical element in successful systems change. The design allowed for longitudinal measurement of Administrator/Social Worker and Parent changes in attitudes and activities related to Parent Leadership within Child Protection Service (CPS) agencies in six California counties. Initial forums held in each county were also evaluated. Additional data collection included measures of effectiveness and usefulness of training and technical assistance provided. Instruments were designed with common elements for use in all counties while allowing for individual county differences. Separate instruments were designed for Administrators/Social Workers and Parents who participated in the project. Discussion will focus on the “real life” aspects of planning, designing and implementing this multi-focused, multi-site evaluation project. Preliminary findings will also be presented.

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: What Do We Mean When We Say Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation?

Business Meeting Session 378 to be held in Ballroom E

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders: Rita O’Sullivan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
                David Fetterman, Stanford University

Discussants: J Bradley Cousins, University of Ottawa
              Jean A King, University of Minnesota
              Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University
              Abraham Wandersman, University of South Carolina

To Grow or Not To Grow: Independent Consultant Evaluators Growing Small Businesses

Panel Session 380 to be held in the Washington A room

Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG

Chair: Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates

Discussant: Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates

Session Abstract: Many self-employed evaluators struggle with how to manage the growing demand for their services. In this panel, three evaluators who
own and operate small evaluation companies will share their experiences of growing their businesses. They will answer questions such as: Why grow a business into more than a solo practice? How do you know it's time to grow? How do you organize for growth? How do you determine who and when to hire? Plenty of time will be reserved for audience questions and discussion.

**Growing Public Policy Associates Incorporated**

**Presenter**  Jeffery Padden, Public Policy Associates Inc  
**Abstract**  Jeffery Padden is the owner and president of Public Policy Associates, Inc. a company established in 1991 that now employs 15 full time staff. PPA conducts public policy research, development, and evaluation projects in the areas of workforce & education, business & economic development, natural resources, and philanthropy. Clients include public agencies at the federal and state levels, school districts, non-profit organizations, and private foundations such as C.S. Mott, The Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg, and the James Irvine Foundation. Over the past 11 years, the firm has completed over 140 projects. In recent years, projects have tended toward the larger-scale, multi-year variety. The management structure includes a full-time business manager, project managers, research associates, and administrative support.

**Growing Barrington Research Group, Inc**

**Presenter**  Gail V Barrington, Barrington Research Group  
**Abstract**  Gail Barrington is owner and president of the Barrington Research Group, Inc. located in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. The firm provides research and program evaluation services to health, education, training and human service programs and has conducted over 100 program evaluation studies since its inception in 1985. Clients include the Canadian federal government, provincial and territorial governments, universities, school boards, health authorities and foundations. Since 1995, the firm has conducted the on-going national evaluation of the Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program (CPNP), funded by Health Canada, a community-based program with over 300 local project sites across Canada. The firm has a staff of 19 and recently hired a Program Evaluation Manager. There are several researchers, both full-time and on contract, a program consultant, a statistician, two research assistants, two IT staff, two administrative staff, a data entry manager and five part-time data entry clerks. A matrix management approach is used and most staff members act as project leaders on specific projects or tasks.

**Growing Camp-Blair Consulting, Inc**

**Presenter**  Donna P Camp, Camp-Blair Consulting Inc  
**Abstract**  Donna Camp is owner of Camp-Blair Consulting, Inc, a company established in 1995 that now employs 6 full time and 4 part-time staff.

**The Impact of Specific Reforms in Needs Assessment, Training, and Reporting on the Design, Implementation and Impact of Private Voluntary Organization Programs: Africare, the American Red Cross, and Catholic Relief Services**

**Panel Session 381 to be held in the Washington B room**  
**Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG**  
**Chair**  Gerald Britan, US Agency for International Development  
**Session Abstract**  Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) implement development programs for donors in many different settings. Generally, donors require specific types of information about results achieved, and PVO management also require specific types of information answering the classic newspaper questions of who, what, when, where and why. Many PVOs struggle with the underlying principles of monitoring and evaluation in determining how to collect and analyze these data requirements. This panel presents a comparison of several PVOs as they implement very different approaches to increasing the capacity of their headquarters and field staff in monitoring and evaluation. The emphasis here is on the organizational context, the particular methods chosen, the process of involving key stakeholders, and the initial implementation phases of the approaches.

**The Evolution of a More Participatory Reporting Process for Africare's USAID Public Law 480 Title II Food Security Programs**

**Presenters**  Della E McMillan, Africare  
Judy C Bryson, Africare  
Lee Thompson, Africare  
Alice Willard, American Red Cross  
**Abstract**  This paper describes how Africare used a participatory process to train its staff in the use of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Title II guidance in the preparation of its annual results reports and resource requests. The approach used included the joint preparation of user-friendly guidance instructions, mentoring and workshop training for headquarters and field staff. In the reporting cycle following initiation of the new process, 100% of Title II CSR4s (Cooperating Sponsor Results Report and Resource Requests) met the basic Africare headquarters' requirements as compared with 25% in the preceding year. The process and early results are analyzed in terms of reporting quality and timeliness based on:
Evaluating Statewide Systemic Initiatives to Improve Mathematics Education

Panel Session 382 to be held in the Potomac I room  
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG

Chair: Norman L. Webb, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Discussant: Bernice T Anderson, National Science Foundation

Session Abstract: This 90 minute panel will include three presentations on evaluation and analytic methods that have been used to study the impact of the National Science Foundation Systemic Initiatives in education. Panel participants are currently completing a 3-year study of the impact of the SSI program and have completed a project that developed statistical models to analyze change in student achievement related to systemic initiatives. They will discuss evaluations of these statewide and urban systemic reforms in light of each state's past efforts and future plans and how data needs change as an initiative matures. National databases on education were used to provide reference points on the extent of student achievement gains and indicators of reform efforts. The main message is that measuring change in student achievement, developing classroom process indicators, and analyzing strategic planning is possible, but requires a tremendous effort. The discussant will help put the work in perspective.

Evaluating System Student Achievement Gains Over Time

Presenter: Norman L. Webb, University of Wisconsin at Madison

Abstract: Results from the State NAEP were used to summarize student achievement trends in the 14 SSI states that participated consistently across 1992, 1996, and 2000. For each state, three kinds of graphs were incorporated into a state profile 1) Grade 4 and Grade 8 trends for the mathematics composite and each subtopic; 2) changes in achievement gaps between ethnic minority and majority students and between economically advantaged and disadvantaged students; 3) cohort growth from grade 4 to grade 8. States are grouped by whether the rate of achievement gain from 1992 to 1996 is sustained from 1996 to 2000. Three categories of growth are used: Sustained progress; Varied progress, and Little Progress. Within each group,
achievement gaps between population subgroups are used as indicators of the equity of achievement gains. Differences between groups will be discussed along with other statistical models for tracking student achievement.

**Using Information from National Databases to Evaluate System Reform**

**Presenter**  
Susan P. Giancola, University of Delaware

**Abstract**  
Several national surveys sample educators and students to permit state-level estimates of a wide variety of characteristics. The databases are valuable resources for exploring similarities and differences among states in their capacity, teacher backgrounds, content covered, and student characteristics. Change over time can be tracked across subsequent administrations of the survey. These databases are invaluable for their potential to provide common measures of reform in all states. Six indicators of mathematics reform, developed from the State NAEP teacher and student questionnaires, will be presented. Using the indicators from 1992, 1996, and 2000, individual state profiles are presented for each of the 14 SSI states that consistently participated in the state NAEP. Changes in the indicators over time are discussed in terms of the state's reform strategies, and representative state profiles are used to illustrate different approaches to systemic reform.

**Using Qualitative Methods to Study System Strategic Planning for Systemic Reform**

**Presenters**  
Sanjeev Sridharan, Westat

**Abstract**  
The statewide systemic initiative program recognized that no single approach could work in every state and gave great latitude to the states in their approaches to reform. This presentation examines the strategic thinking of the SSIs through reviewing proposals and reports from 21 SSIs and semi-structured interviews with leaders in 12 of the SSIs. Results focus on lessons learned about 1) influencing the state education system; 2) cooperating with existing reform efforts; 3) sequencing and balancing interventions; and 4) gaining public, political, and professional support for system reform. Strategic thinking is hypothesized to lead to an initiative characterized by high quality interventions that are sustained as part of a comprehensive program of continuous improvement.

**Evaluating Substance Abuse and Violence Prevention**

**MultiPaper Session 383 to be held in the Potomac II room**

**Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG**

**Chair**  
Janet Kane, University of Wisconsin at Madison

**Domestic Violence Effects on Mothers and Children: A Program Evaluation**

**Presenter**  
Pamela Roddy, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention

**Abstract**  
This project was designed to provide a program evaluation of counseling efficacy in both mothers and their children completing therapy who were exposed to domestic violence. The sample consisted of all parental program completers (n=85) and their children over a three-year period ending in June 2002. The primary intervention included separate groups for parents and children. Children's groups were age appropriate and they ran concurrently with the parents group. Pretest assessments and posttest assessments using known and reliable measures were used to measure various dimensions of well-being in both the parent and the child. Special attention was paid to those parents and children scoring above the clinical cutoff at the pretest and these findings are displayed separately.

**Dosage Effects of Intervention Programs for Children of Substance Users**

**Presenters**  
John A. Hermann, ORC Macro

Ronaldo Iachan, ORC Macro

Joseph Johnston, ORC Macro

Pamela Roddy, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention

**Abstract**  
This paper presents alternative approaches to analyzing dosage data. The data are from the Children of Substance Abusing Parents study funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. The study used a quasi-experimental design where each of the 13 program sites enrolled experimental and comparison samples of child-parent dyads (N=2,000). Individual dosage data were collected on program participants. The analysis of dosage effects examines how the amount and frequency of program exposure may affect or mediate program effects. Multivariate analysis methods are used to examine the effects on a variety of outcomes of alternative dosage measures, including the amount, duration, and intensity of program contacts associated with each intervention. This paper presents useful results of regression modeling and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) methods. The analysis provides methods for quantifying the effects of process variables on the ultimate outcomes, and provides evidence of these effects in this evaluation study.

**Safe Schools/Healthy Students: Lessons Learned in a Local Evaluation**

**Presenter**  
Sanjeev Sridharan, Westat

**Abstract**  
The statewide systemic initiative program recognized that no single approach could work in every state and gave great latitude to the states in their approaches to reform. This presentation examines the strategic thinking of the SSIs through reviewing proposals and reports from 21 SSIs and semi-structured interviews with leaders in 12 of the SSIs. Results focus on lessons learned about 1) influencing the state education system; 2) cooperating with existing reform efforts; 3) sequencing and balancing interventions; and 4) gaining public, political, and professional support for system reform. Strategic thinking is hypothesized to lead to an initiative characterized by high quality interventions that are sustained as part of a comprehensive program of continuous improvement.

**Using Information from National Databases to Evaluate System Reform**

**Presenter**  
Susan P. Giancola, University of Delaware

**Abstract**  
Several national surveys sample educators and students to permit state-level estimates of a wide variety of characteristics. The databases are valuable resources for exploring similarities and differences among states in their capacity, teacher backgrounds, content covered, and student characteristics. Change over time can be tracked across subsequent administrations of the survey. These databases are invaluable for their potential to provide common measures of reform in all states. Six indicators of mathematics reform, developed from the State NAEP teacher and student questionnaires, will be presented. Using the indicators from 1992, 1996, and 2000, individual state profiles are presented for each of the 14 SSI states that consistently participated in the state NAEP. Changes in the indicators over time are discussed in terms of the state's reform strategies, and representative state profiles are used to illustrate different approaches to systemic reform.
Abstract: The creation of a federal Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SSHS) initiative reflects a growing level of concern across the United States that many children do not feel safe at school and that teachers must receive a new level of training to better equip themselves to manage a diverse student population. The Delaware SSHS program began during the 2000-2001 academic year and has provided district students with services to improve school safety, decrease school violence, and improve student mental health. For three years, the local evaluation team has collected information regarding project implementation and its impact on school safety and teacher preparedness to manage student misbehavior. The purpose of this paper is to document lessons learned from the evaluation of this project. The lessons learned will take three strands: 1) lessons learned about the project itself, 2) lessons learned about evaluation, and 3) lessons learned about evaluating federal initiatives.

Using Evaluation Data to Develop an Effective Alcohol Prevention Program

Using Evaluation Data to Develop an Effective Alcohol Prevention Program

Presenters: Mary Lou Bell, Bell Group
Tara Kelley-Baker, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
Kappie Bliss, Bliss Inc
Kate Jones, Bell Group

Abstract: Protecting You/Protecting Me (PY/PM) is a classroom-based alcohol prevention program developed by MADD that targets children in Grades 1-5. The intervention is designed to prevent injury and death of children and youth due to underage consumption of alcoholic beverages and vehicle crashes when riding with impaired drivers. Since the inception of the project, evaluation data have been gathered and used to determine program goals, develop and revise the curriculum, assess effective methods of delivery, and improve effectiveness. This paper will outline what evaluation data (including a number of innovative techniques such as Kibble’s Journey Mapping, Roberts-Gray’s Bridge-It implementation survey, and web page with online surveys and evaluation tools) were gathered and provide specific examples of how the findings were used to improve the curriculum, program, and implementation. The value of collecting evaluation data early and effectively using the results, as well as pitfalls that have been encountered, will be discussed.

Evaluation From the Perspective of Three Generations of Evaluators

Evaluation From the Perspective of Three Generations of Evaluators

Panel Session 384 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair: George Julnes, Utah State University
Session Abstract: The field of Evaluation has undergone many changes in the past 40 years, from an emerging field to a well-established one. This symposium will describe the changes in evaluation over the past 4 decades from the perspective of three generations of evaluators. The talk will begin with Len Bickman’s entry into the field in the 1960’s, continue with the Debra Rog’s entrance in the 1980’s and conclude with Stephanie Reich’s present day entry. Issues of values, methods, application, and dissemination will be discussed.

Incorporating LGBT Evaluators and LGBT Issues in AEA and Evaluation Practice

Incorporating LGBT Evaluators and LGBT Issues in AEA and Evaluation Practice

Think Tank Session 385 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues TIG
Facilitators: Denice A Cassaro, Cornell University
Xan Young, Education Development Center
Abstract: In this session, we will be exploring how we can better incorporate LGBT evaluators and LGBT issues in AEA and the field of evaluation. Through the format of a think tank, two main areas will be discussed. The first examines our involvement in AEA and the contributions we (evaluators who identify as LGBT or as allies) can make within the organization. The second examines avenues we can explore to make contributions to the field of evaluation through education. Questions for discussion will include: 1) How do we increase our visibility, involvement and representation in AEA; 2) How do we build coalitions within AEA to address the issues/needs of underrepresented groups; 3) How do we educate evaluators around LGBT issues; and, 4) is there interest in creating a proposal for New Directions focusing on LGBT issues.

Reforming Evaluation Practices in Foundations

Reforming Evaluation Practices in Foundations

MultiPaper Session 386 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Promoting Evaluation Use in Organizations

Presenter: Lester Baxter, The Pew Charitable Trusts

Abstract: This paper will describe how the use of evaluations is promoted, both formally and informally, in a large national foundation. The paper argues that a meaningful organizational policy on evaluation is a necessary but not sufficient step in amplifying the value that evaluation can deliver to the institution. Perhaps as important are the informal and unprescribed actions that staff take throughout the evaluation process, from selecting projects for study, framing evaluation questions, selecting evaluators, determining evaluation methods, overseeing the study, to bringing results into the organization and promoting the broadest possible appropriate use of the findings. The paper will describe how an organization's policies and staff behaviors can work in concert to increase evaluation use. The result will be a detailed description of how the practice of evaluation can influence the organization's focus and performance.

Laying the Groundwork for Foundation-focused Evaluation: Practical Advice for Unearthing and Clarifying Expectations and Theories

Presenters: Douglas V. Easterling, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Kristin Bradley-Bull, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Quinton E. Baker, QE Baker Associates

Abstract: How can foundations become more deliberate and strategic in incorporating evaluation into their planning and decision making? More specifically, how can an outside evaluator work with the staff and board to elicit a logic model and/or theory of change that represents the foundation's thinking, and then to use that model to guide programming and evaluation? The authors have worked with a variety of foundations (family, community, health-conversion) on the development of logic models and theories of change. Our presentation will include: 1) the processes we have used to cultivate interest in evaluation, 2) methods for working with staff and board to surface their theories about how the foundation's strategy will "work," and 3) barriers that tend to block foundations from thinking strategically and critically about their theories and approaches. We will also present some of the benefits that have begun to accrue to our clients who have pursued evaluation.

Developing a Method for Classifying Evaluation Activities in a Philanthropic Foundation

Presenters: Victor Kuo, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Gary T. Henry, Georgia State University

Abstract: Classifying evaluations within an organization for administrative purposes can be quite a challenge. While theorists have developed different purposes and typologies of evaluation, operationalizing those categories in a real life organization reveals how challenging it is for the conceptual "rubber" to hit the road. In this session, presenters will share how a methodological approach to classifying numerous evaluations was developed and carried out in a philanthropic foundation. Presenters will also share strengths and challenges of conceptual categories as they are implemented in practice. This session will be of interest to evaluation managers and supervisors; those concerned with evaluation use; and evaluation in nonprofits and foundations.

Creative Tools and Processes for Systems Level Evaluation in Organizations

MultiPaper Session 387 to be held in the Conference Theater room

Promoting Evaluation Use in Organizations

Chair: R. Sam Larson, Applied Research

A Systems-level Approach to Manage Change in Organizations Through the Use of Different Performance Management Tools and Techniques

Presenter: Geraldina Villalobos-Quezada, Western Michigan University

Evaluation and Organizational Development in Various Approaches to Organizational Learning

Presenters: Vicki M. Staebler Tardino, Saint Louis University
Rosalie T. Torres, Developmental Studies Center
Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico

Abstract: Organizational learning is widely promoted as means for achieving sustainable competitive advantage and for designing organizations that are flexible, responsive, and innovative (Daft, 1998; DeGeus, 1988; Drucker, 1994; Garvin, 2000; McGill & Slocum, 1993; Senge, 1990; Shaw & Perkins, 1992; Stata, 1989; Tsang, 1997). The literature on organizational learning spans numerous disciplines, including organization development, evaluation, and management. The purpose of this paper is to examine four approaches that promote some form of organizational learning -- empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, 2000), evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations (Preskill & Torres, 1999), emergent learning approaches (Darling & Parry, 1999), and developmental evaluation (Patton, 1997) -- and to articulate their differences and similarities, particularly in the extent to which they focus on...
organization development and evaluation practices. The paper concludes with an analysis of what practitioners from different disciplines have to offer and learn from each other in their approaches to organizational learning.

Facilitating Systemic Reflection: The Learning History as an Evaluative Tool

Abstract
Organizational learning is widely promoted as means for achieving sustainable competitive advantage and for designing organizations that are flexible, responsive, and innovative (Daft, 1998; DeGeus, 1988; Drucker, 1994; Garvin, 2000; McGill & Slocum, 1993; Senge, 1990; Shaw & Perkins, 1992; Stata, 1989; Tsang, 1997). The literature on organizational learning spans numerous disciplines, including organization development, evaluation, and management. The purpose of this paper is to examine four approaches that promote some form of organizational learning -- empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, 2000), evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations (Preskill & Torres, 1999), emergent learning approaches (Darling & Parry, 1999), and developmental evaluation (Patton, 1997) -- and to articulate their differences and similarities, particularly in the extent to which they focus on organization development and evaluation practices. The paper concludes with an analysis of what practitioners from different disciplines have to offer and learn from each other in their approaches to organizational learning.

Roundtables: Education II

Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 2:25 pm.
Roundtables Session 388 to be held in the Tidewater room

First Rotation – Table A: Application of Innovative Criteria for Evaluating Distance Education Courses

Abstract
This paper outlines the evaluation plan for a graduate-level course taught through the distance education delivery system at Western Michigan University. There are two categories of distance education delivery systems that are being used for this course: synchronous instruction and asynchronous instruction. Also, this paper provides information to guide distance education decision-makers in identifying effective strategies for improving these types of courses. In order to address multiple perspectives when evaluating distance education courses, two general criteria and four general domains are adapted and used for carrying out this evaluation. The efficacy criterion addresses the outcome measures domain, while the effectiveness criterion addresses the technical, instructional, and ethical domains. Also, a systemic way for organizing, applying, and reporting the formative evaluation process for distance education courses is provided. After describing the findings of the evaluation, recommendations are provided on what to consider when designing and delivering distance education courses.

First Rotation – Table B: How Does Entrepreneurial Education Impact the Educational Outcomes, Psychosocial Development and Entrepreneurial Behavior of Low-Income Youth?

Abstract
Our project is concerned with how entrepreneurial behavior develops, and how an experiential youth entrepreneurship program can foster positive educational and psychosocial outcomes for low-income youth in particular. Our research team from the Harvard Graduate School of Education is evaluating the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship’s (NFTE) youth entrepreneurship programs for low-income youth. We are in the second year of a multi-year longitudinal study that is investigating how NFTE students make meaning of and apply their entrepreneurial learning experiences across multiple domains. During the pilot of phase of our research, we found that entrepreneurship education can serve as a vehicle for promoting critical thinking skills and social engagement. We are now measuring why and how NFTE students might improve in school as a result of their NFTE participation. We are also looking at the ways in which the program might help students to think and behave more entrepreneurially.

First Rotation – Table C: Implementing a Systemwide Program Impact Initiative at the University of Wisconsin-extension

Abstract
The University of Wisconsin - Extension recently started a systemwide evaluation initiative to identify and report the impact of its programs in cooperative extension, continuing education, business and manufacturing, and public broadcasting divisions. Educators are encouraged to move beyond traditional evaluation that measures program and course outputs or learner satisfaction, to evaluating the longer-term impact of programs on the individual, community, civic, and environmental well-being of Wisconsin residents. The goals of the initiative are to demonstrate accountability, communicate value, and improve programs. This roundtable session will review some short-term outcomes, and the challenges of developing a systemwide framework, building capacity among programmers, and adopting an impact evaluation philosophy among diverse units with differing goals. Discussion will focus on
moving from evaluation theory to practice and the implications for taking on such an initiative in a large, complex organization.

**First Rotation - Table D: Usability Evaluation: Augmenting the Current User-centered Design Approach to Accommodate the Child Learner**

**Presenter**
Linda Morell, University of California at Berkeley

**Abstract**
Usability research is designed to identify and eliminate issues associated with a particular technology that can interfere with a person's use of a technology-based product and subsequent productivity. Through a case study of usability research completed in August 2001, this paper identifies how and why the boundaries of usability study should be expanded to include a systematic framework for accommodating the child learner and how this framework differs from current usability study (which is typically conducted to identify the usability issues of an adult user). For this paper, a case study of one usability project is examined to elicit dialogue on ways to accommodate the needs of a child learner into the usability framework. The usability project discussed was designed to investigate and identify specific issues associated with selected science and mathematics-based educational web activities. The study was also designed to identify general guidelines for content providers and software developers to follow when developing this type of software. The usability research builds on previous study regarding the usability of children’s technology-based products. Findings from the study regarding specific issues and general information are presented as a case for expanding the concept of the user-centered design approach to accommodate the unique goals of educational software designed for the child learner.

**First Rotation - Table E: Answering the So What Question: Evaluating the Impact of a Research Institution**

**Presenter**
Satsuki L Scoville, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Abstract**
Usability research is designed to identify and eliminate issues associated with a particular technology that can interfere with a person's use of a technology-based product and subsequent productivity. Through a case study of usability research completed in August 2001, this paper identifies how and why the boundaries of usability study should be expanded to include a systematic framework for accommodating the child learner and how this framework differs from current usability study (which is typically conducted to identify the usability issues of an adult user). For this paper, a case study of one usability project is examined to elicit dialogue on ways to accommodate the needs of a child learner into the usability framework. The usability project discussed was designed to investigate and identify specific issues associated with selected science and mathematics-based educational web activities. The study was also designed to identify general guidelines for content providers and software developers to follow when developing this type of software. The usability research builds on previous study regarding the usability of children’s technology-based products. Findings from the study regarding specific issues and general information are presented as a case for expanding the concept of the user-centered design approach to accommodate the unique goals of educational software designed for the child learner.

**First Rotation - Table F: The Effect of University Tenure and Promotion Policy on Evaluation in Extension**

**Presenter**
Allison H Nichols, West Virginia University Extension Service

**Abstract**
At West Virginia University Extension, all county agents hold faculty positions and almost all have teaching and research as their areas of significant contribution. This policy, which began around 1985, has affected the amount and quality of evaluation efforts. On the positive side, there has been an increase in the number of program evaluations being attempted and completed. However, on the negative side, county agents have become frustrated in their attempts to make evaluation reports fit the research demands of promotion and tenure committees. In addition, county agents, for the most part, have not been trained to conduct research, so the responsibility for training about research often falls on the shoulder of the evaluation specialist. This paper will report on interviews conducted with county agents, specialists, and administrators on their perspectives on this issue. Recommendations will be given for building the capacity of Extension faculty to meet these new research demands within the structure of program evaluation.

**First Rotation - Table G: Product Use Testing in Education: Evaluating How Interventions Influence Knowledge/Practice Ecologies**

**Presenters**
Thomas C Crochunis, Education Alliance
Deborah Collins, Brown University

**Abstract**
When education research and development organizations create products that aim to affect education in the field, they make a variety of assumptions about how knowledge development and utilization can influence practice. Some attempt to represent and disseminate innovations based on research or to synthesize complex information in forms designed to engage educators in inquiry and learning, while others offer processes and tools to guide communities engaged in change. However, actual product influence often varies from intended purpose, sometimes in ways that illuminate how products and other interventions affect ecologies of knowledge and practice. This paper will describe a pilot approach to evaluating the influence of education product use. Through a series of stages of investigation, the process studies key elements that influence knowledge and practice. The paper describes the rationale for the design, its field application, and initial findings from the first cycle of use testing.
Abstract Cost analysis is an evaluation technique rarely used in Extension education or in education in general. But with the current demand for accountability for the use of public dollars, cost analysis could be used to advantage to demonstrate that funding sources and the public are getting returns on their dollars that exceed the costs of the programs. Presenters of this roundtable will review evaluation systems currently in place, identify "best practices" in evaluation and explore ways in which evaluation systems can be integrated into a unified, methodologically sound evaluation system. Presenters will facilitate a discussion of how the EEE-TIG can help promote quality evaluation of youth development programs throughout the country utilizing questions such as: How can we ensure that: 1) systems are based on sound evaluation methodology, 2) program design is linked to program evaluation, 3) outcome indicators are based on empirical research, and 4) reliability and validity issues are addressed?

Second Rotation – Table B: Needs Assessment and User-centered Evaluation of an Online Digital Video Library

Presenters
Deborah Stirling, Arizona State University
Jennifer Borse, Rockman & Al

Abstract
The National Educational Technology Standards Digital Video Library (NETS DVL) is an evolving, web-based video library supporting teacher education programs and teacher professional development. The goals of the needs assessment and evaluation of the NETS DVL are to maximize usability and utility by means of formative user-centered evaluation, and to understand how user-centered evaluation techniques, usability testing, and web-based resource evaluation methods can be applied to digital video libraries. The NETS DVL combines the characteristics of digital libraries, content-based retrieval systems, and database technologies to support the national effort to improve teacher education programs and prepare teachers to infuse technology across the curriculum.

Second Rotation – Table C: Logic Models and Power Analysis as Tools for Evaluating National Agenda Issues

Presenters
Curtis Mearns, Albuquerque Public Schools
Debra O Heath, Albuquerque Public Schools

Abstract
Authors discuss implementation issues that lead to the likelihood of finding no program impact. Well known evaluation practices avoid condemning theories based on poor implementation. Using this as an analogy authors apply the same concept to a higher level of analysis of national agenda issues such as reducing substance abuse or improving education. Conclusions about individual program outcomes may warrant consideration of the larger milieu of competing or complementary programs. Logic models from program descriptions of existing programs aimed at national agenda issues are merged to produce a system level program description. A discussion of logic models linked with power analysis may help explain the need for cautious interpretation of single programs dealing with national agenda issues and the phenomenon of cyclical outcomes.

Second Rotation – Table D: Using On-line, Interactive, Portfolio Assessments in Program, Course, and Learner Evaluations: A Dialogic and Open-systems Framework

Presenter
Richard A Parkany, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract
This study investigates portfolios for an on-line teacher preparation course concerning integration of educational informatics in various domains and pedagogies. The milieu is the LotusNotes/Domino asynchronous classroom space. The purpose of the study is to investigate: (a) how it is that portfolios generated in such electronic spaces can be assessed by appropriate standards, thereby extending such assessments beyond their current criterion-based methods; (b) the nature and structure of cultural spaces in these environments; (c) instructor/peer factors influencing the development of literate discourse in these spaces; and (d) how the depth, breadth, and articulation of this electronic discourse can be improved. The framework is based in an action research agenda and based in the voice of a "reflective practitioner". Methods include: traditional discourse analysis, subject interviews, network, and content/text analyses used in more traditional ethnographic, phenomenographic, and other open-systems analyses. Specifically, the electronic portfolios will be treated as individual case studies.

Second Rotation – Table E: Cost Analysis: An Evaluation Technique That Could be Used More Effectively to Reform Extension Education and Provide Accountability to Decision Makers

Presenter
Marilyn H Grantham, University of Minnesota

Abstract
Cost analysis is an evaluation technique rarely used in Extension education or in education in general. But with the current demand for accountability for the use of public dollars, cost analysis could be used to advantage to demonstrate that funding sources and the public are getting returns on their dollars that exceed the costs of the programs.

The purpose of this roundtable discussion will be to explore why cost analysis isn't used more frequently and effectively in Extension education and what Extension evaluators might do to make greater use of it.
Second Rotation - Table F: Establishing Statewide Learning Guidelines: Is It Helpful for Program Evaluators?

Presenters
Sarah C Luchs, Ohio Department of Education
Lucile Seabrook, Ohio Department of Education, Policy Research & Analysis
Larry Fruth, Ohio Department of Education, Policy Research & Analysis

Abstract
There has been tremendous growth in electronic learning opportunities and more recently in electronic schools. How are these programs currently evaluated? What guidelines currently exist to inform the development of eLearning programs and ensure their quality? Can programmatic guidelines be useful to evaluators of eLearning programs? To what extent should programmatic guidelines for eLearning include standards for evaluation? Are the Joint Committee Standards sufficient in this context? Representatives from the Ohio Department of Education are embracing the challenge of designing guidelines that help shape the quality of eLearning and eSchools. The current draft addresses both programmatic (curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, professional development, program evaluation) and operational components (enrollment, governance, finance). Roundtable participants will take home the draft guidelines and list of indicators (from the literature reviewed) as well as learn about the development process and challenges of undertaking this work in the public sector/policy-making context. Participants will explore how these guidelines might shape future evaluations.

Second Rotation - Table G: Evaluating Project-based Learning Using Technology in a Virtual High school: Best Evaluation Practices?

Abstract
This three-year study is about the early stages of the implementation in three high schools of a school within a school extensively using technology in project-based learning. The big idea in this Technology Challenge Grant is to create a virtual high school linking schools with each other, and with universities and businesses to conduct a series of project-based learning activities. To date we have conducted a baseline study of teaching and learning using technology, and have undertaken a series of follow-up data collection on specific projects underway. This paper will provide some early results for our site visits, but will focus more on methodology, the evaluation design and key questions, and the methods for data collection. We will discuss how well the data collection methods are working and what key evaluation questions we are able to begin to address.

Myth or Reality? Recognizing and Overcoming Evaluands' Obstacles to Evaluation

Think Tank Session 390 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG
Facilitators
Jo Ann Doino-Ingersoll, Strategic Research
James Riedel, Girl Scouts of the USA
Stanley J Capela, Heartshare Human Services

Abstract
The goal of this think tank session is to explore beliefs, or ‘myths’, that clients sometimes hold about evaluation and how these myths are often related to the larger systems within which clients work. Also to be examined is how these beliefs can create obstacles to evaluation and various ways of overcoming them in order to promote evaluation use. Presenters will begin with a description of a community-service project being undertaken by a local AEA affiliate, The New York Metro Evaluators’ Network (NYMEN), on behalf of the Support Center for Nonprofit Management. The project consists of a series of columns written by NYMEN members for publication in the Support Center’s monthly newsletter that are designed to dispel evaluation myths. Presenters will then facilitate a brainstorming session on the identification of additional evaluation myths/obstacles and lead small groups in working out potentially effective solutions.

National Evaluation Data Services: Maximizing the Investment of Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Panel Session 391 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair
Patrick Coleman, Caliber Associates
Discussant
Ellen Radis, Caliber Associates
Session Abstract The National Evaluation Data Services (NEDS) project, conducted under contract by Caliber Associates, was established and by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) to maximize the significant resources allotted to Federal and state substance abuse related data collection efforts. Project activities concentrate on the acquisition of Federal and state substance abuse treatment databases, maintenance to support data management, secondary data analysis of treatment need and demand, cost analyses, and a variety of print and online reports. Project activities additionally focus on the development of Government Performance and Reporting (GPRA) standards and reporting processes, online evaluative methodologies, and the production of evaluative findings for use by a range of key stakeholders. These stakeholders include researchers, Federal policy-makers, state substance abuse planning agencies, and substance abuse treatment program personnel. During this session, panel members will describe the framework of three principal NEDS strategies, these include (1) building data infrastructure, (2) knowledge development, and (3) knowledge sharing/dissemination.

**Data Acquisition and Secondary Analysis**

**Presenters**

Richard Finkbiner, Caliber Associates  
Sheila McKinney-Bolden, Caliber Associates

**Abstract**

A central objective of the National Evaluation Data Services (NEDS) contract is to develop state-of-the-art secondary analyses that maximize the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment=s (CSAT) prior data investments. Critical to that objective is the availability of a comprehensive range of substance abuse treatment data holdings. NEDS has pursued a three-tiered strategy for acquiring data resources. These strategies include acquiring: (1) analytic feasibility studies of state administrative and management datasets, (2) solicitation and peer-review based selection of secondary analysis plans from selected organizations and principal investigators (PIs), and (3) NEDS subcontractor-initiated analytic plans. The goals of this session are to: (1) describe the challenges in accessing secondary data resources under the NEDS contract, (2) identify programmatic strategies for effective utilization and analysis of secondary data sources, and (3) provide examples of conceptual and methodological approaches to the secondary analysis of substance abuse treatment datasets.

**Online Transmission in Knowledge Development**

**Presenters**

Charles Lewis, Caliber Associates  
Jeanne Wolf, Caliber Associates

**Abstract**

New technologies make it possible to provide the substance abuse treatment community with data collection and analysis tools that were not previously feasible. Advances in data storage and transfer capabilities and Web based methodologies make it possible to collect data with greater accuracy, analyze them in real time at lower cost, and generate a variety of reports. This rapid data collection, analysis, and reporting allows decision-makers to rapidly address client needs and therefore redirect limited resources to the greatest need. A recent survey by the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD) found 14 states and one territory were likely to build or buy a model Web-based data system, 14 states were unsure and 13 states were unlikely. Five states did not respond to the survey. Five states have existing Web-based data systems and other states are in various stages of planning and developing systems.

**Online Methodologies for Information Sharing and Dissemination**

**Presenters**

Michael E Wolf-Branigin, Caliber Associates  
Gayle Wisdom, Caliber Associates

**Abstract**

This presentation focuses on activities that support providing NEDS products and evaluation methodologies to key substance abuse treatment constituents. This presentation will introduce attendees to a variety of resources developed for state substance administrative/planning agencies and substance abuse treatment programs. The evaluation activities will include methods applicable to small area estimation, cost analysis, and quality improvement. Results of scientifically valid substance abuse treatment data analyses are valuable only if they reach the right people in a useful format. NEDS provides its analytic products in multiple formats including analytic technical reports on various treatment concerns, fact sheets produced on specific topics, and briefing toolkits. Additionally, methods development guides and manuals on substance abuse treatment evaluation, evaluation training packages and program evaluation data collection instruments are available.

**Online Evaluation of Proposals and Other Documents**

Skill-building Workshop Session 392 to be held in the Roosevelt room  
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG  
Chair Johnetta Davis, Humanitas Inc  
Session Abstract Convening busy evaluation professionals to review proposals and other documents is often difficult and costly. ePanel©, an online document evaluation management tool, combines Internet and conference call technologies to address these problems. ePanel© has been used by dozens of international scientists since 1999 to support monthly online reviews sponsored by the National Institutes of Health. Practice using ePanel© in a 90-minute
session, where you will learn how to: Set up a review panel, Facilitate panel communication, Post a document for review, Review and score a document privately, Review others' posted evaluations privately, Meet to discuss posted evaluations, Organize conference call discussions for maximum productivity, Score a document as a group, Develop a consensus document, Post the consensus document to an archive, Retrieve an archived consensus document, and Generate routine and ad-hoc management reports about the review process.

Presenters
- Johnetta Davis, Humanitas Inc
- Jordan S Hirsch, Humanitas Inc
- Andrew Smith, Humanitas Inc
- Maura Kephart, Humanitas Inc

Evaluating Literacy Programs

MultiPaper Session 393 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair - Gary Miron, Western Michigan University

The Development and Use of an Analytic Rubric to Evaluate the Impact of a State-Wide K-12 Literacy Program

Presenters
- Radhika Rajgopal, Indiana University
- Patricia A Muller, Indiana University

Abstract
As part of an evaluation of a state-wide program to improve children's reading abilities in grades PreK-4, an external evaluator developed a comprehensive literacy rubric for assessing program effectiveness and impact. The analytic rubric provides both quantitative and qualitative assessments based upon multiple sources of evidence from a variety of key stakeholders. The rubric was developed using a research-based literacy framework that ensures schools and districts address eight important elements for improvement: planning for coherence, effective core programs, on-going professional development, safety nets, assessment and accountability, home and school partnerships, community support, and resources. This paper discusses both the process for designing such literacy rubrics for formative and summative evaluation purposes, as well as the implementation and results of the literacy rubric.

The Impact of Even Start Programs in Rural and Urban Settings

Presenters
- John H Hitchcock, State University of New York at Albany
- Nicole Catapano, State University of New York at Albany
- Robyn Baliber, State University of New York at Albany
- Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract
The Even Start Family Literacy Program aims to improve the educational opportunities for families by providing literacy skills to parents and pre-kindergarten children. In this paper, the effects of two Even Start programs - one rural, one urban - are summarized. Due to the environments in which they are located, the programs offer services using different approaches to parent literacy, early childhood education, and parenting education. In the rural community, the program centers on home visits, utilizing technology to facilitate some of the interactive literacy activities. In the urban setting, the program activities are based in a central location and include English as a second language education due to the large Hispanic population. While the programs address the needs of the community and the goals of Even Start differently, the outcomes of both programs are positive and were possible with the assistance of collaborating agencies. Impacts on the communities are discussed.

Evaluation of a Beginning Reading Program: A Case Study in Design Sensitivity

Presenter - Greg J Roberts, University of Texas at Austin

Abstract
Lipsey's notion of design sensitivity (Lipsey, 1990) deserves increased attention, especially among program evaluators and measurement experts working on questions related to beginning reading. Federal policy in this area is increasingly driven by research on the mechanics of reading and on the elements of quality beginning reading instruction. Evidence-based practice is becoming the norm. Evaluation of beginning reading programs and development of early reading assessments will be improved to the degree that they build upon the substantive research in this area. Comparative reanalysis of data from evaluation of Voyager's TreeHouse beginning reading program as used in a large Southeastern School District suggests that selection of dependent measures, study design, and analysis technique can have a considerable impact on one's findings and bear directly on policy recommendations based on such findings.

Evaluating Early Head Start: A Federal Initiative to Enhance Evaluation by Supporting Research Partnerships
The proposed panel will describe the local-national research partnerships developed during a 5-year evaluation of the Early Head Start initiative. As a part of this program, a major cross-site experimental study was mandated. At the same time, the Head Start Bureau proffered a vision for enhancing the evaluation through partnerships between national evaluators, local researchers, and program partners. The Head Start Bureau had sponsored consortiums of national contractors and local researchers in the past and had been challenged to maximize the potential of these partnerships at all levels. It was hoped that through structural and other innovations, the EHS evaluation could overcome these challenges. During the course of the study, the consortium was challenged to work through a number of issues common to multi-site evaluation studies. This panel will describe strategies and processes through which these challenges were overcome to enhance the overall quality of local and national research efforts, from the perspective of federal funders, the national contractor, and local researchers.

Promoting Local-national Research Partnerships: The Federal Vision

Presenter: Helen Raikes, US Dept of Health and Human Services

Abstract: Following recommendations of Head Start Advisory groups in the early 1990’s, the Head Start Bureau proffered a vision for capacity building in local communities by promoting university partnerships with programs. At the same time, many believed that the Early Head Start (EHS) evaluation required the rigor and uniformity of an experimental study conducted by a national contractor. The Head Start Bureau had sponsored consortiums of national contractors and local researchers in the past and had been challenged to maximize the potential of the research and partnership at all levels. It was hoped that the EHS evaluation, with separately funded local and national evaluations, would help meet this goal. Finally, the EHS program announcements included a challenge for the research to support continuous program improvement. Thus, the Head Start Bureau provided a vision for the partnership between local and national researchers, and through its cooperative agreements, provided support to enable the goals of the many components to be effective.

The Early Head Start Evaluation: Partnership Issues from a National Evaluator Perspective

Presenter: John Love, Mathematica Policy Research Inc

Abstract: The national contractor’s role in the Early Head Start evaluation was to carry out the vision of the federal sponsors, ensure the implementation of a randomized design, and create partnerships with local research teams and 17 participating programs. To accomplish these, the national contractor worked with the funding agency (ACYF) and the local research and program teams through a formal consortium, with a steering committee, publications policies, and more than a dozen workgroups that carried out specific cross-site activities. The collaboration dealt with accommodating different approaches to conducting research at the local and national levels, carrying out the mandate to provide continuous improvement information to programs while avoiding premature release of impact findings, incorporating local research in with the national cross-site findings, and the need to limit publication of findings until the federal release of impact findings. The paper will discuss benefits and challenges of the cross-site, national-local, research-program collaborations.

The Early Start Evaluation: Benefits and Challenges from a Local Researcher Perspective

Presenter: Beth L Green, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc

Abstract: The evaluation of Early Head Start, like many cross-site evaluations of major federal initiatives, called for a national cross-site evaluation team to work in partnership with local evaluators in each of 17 sites. Somewhat uniquely, however, local researchers were provided with separate funding to work with local programs to conduct site-specific research on program functioning. Local researchers were not required to modify their research studies to accommodate cross-site measurement. Local researchers partnered with the national contractor to ensure integration of these site specific findings into published reports, ongoing program improvement efforts, and national data analysis plans. This paper will describe the benefits and challenges of this national consortium model, and the specific strategies used by the consortium to negotiate differences in perspectives and roles between local and national evaluators.

The Early Head Start Evaluation: The Role of Local Program-Research Partnerships

Presenter: Judy J Carta, Juniper Garden Children's Project

Abstract: Partnerships between EHS programs and researchers were created in the evaluation of Early Head Start (EHS) when University-based research teams in 17 cities received grants to fulfill two different but related functions: (1) they were to assist in the design, implementation and translation of the national EHS evaluation, and (2) they were to generate their own research study in collaboration with their local EHS program partner. Research-program partnerships examined key aspects of the intervention variables such as: their relationship to the program’s theory of change, the effects of different levels of engagement in the intervention on program outcomes, and an understanding of community influences affecting intervention outcomes. This paper will identify these and other ways in which local partnerships helped in translating and expanding impacts from the national evaluation.
Innovative Evaluations
MultiPaper Session 395 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG
Chair Kathy M Girton, Utah State University
Discussants George Reinhardt, National Research Council
William Rickards, Alverno College

Presenter Fatma Mizikaci, Baskent University
Abstract The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Tourism and Hotel Management Program at Baskent University in terms of Total Quality Management (TQM) principles based on a model developed by the researcher. The model is based on the systems approach which incorporates three subsystems of higher education; social system, technical system and management system. On the base of the model components, the study was conducted in three main phases. In the first phase, in order to analyse the inputs of the program, written documents were reviewed and those directly related to the TQM implementations were analysed. In the second phase, transforming process of the program was analysed on the base of the perceptions of shareholders. In this stage, 320 students were given three different questionnaires; 22 instructors were given two different questionnaires; and 24 parents were given a questionnaire. Then, an interview was conducted with the Quality Coordinator of the school. Reliability of the instruments was measured by using Cronbach Alpha test. All the instruments were pilot-tested. Data were analysed using means and standard deviations. In the last phase, outputs of the program were analysed through the review of written documents; interviews with employers; and questionnaire for the graduates. Data gathered from the interviews were analysed using qualitative data analysis. Data gathered through the graduates' questionnaires were analysed using means and standard deviations. Results of the input stage showed that the activities were implemented and documented in accordance with Total Quality Management principles. In terms of transforming process, shareholders seemed to be neutral about the program operations. As for the last stage, employers' expectations from the graduates and the program were based on the affective characteristics like communication skills, interpersonal relations, work discipline and working culture.

Moving towards a More Systemic Process for Evaluating Field Experiences and Student Teaching in Schools of Education
Presenters Pamela A Sandoval, Indiana University Northwest
Stacy Gray Akeya, Indiana University Northwest
Abstract The purpose of this paper will be to explicate how our school of education has moved towards a systemic process to evaluate our teacher education candidate's performance in field experiences and student teaching. This systemic process is integrated into overall program assessment as required by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. This systemic approach includes demonstrations that teacher education candidates have met the outcomes expected of beginning teachers, and that they do this in the context found in classrooms. This paper will explicate how candidates and teachers complete periodic and end of the semester surveys, and how candidates also develop artifacts for their portfolio that are judged based on a set of rubrics that reflect our expected program outcomes.

Evaluating a Student Electronic Portfolio Builder in an Ongoing PT3 Project
Presenters Nick Eastmond, Utah State University
Kyeong-Ju Seo, Utah State University
Matthew Taylor, Utah State University
Abstract Utah State University's PT3 project is a three-year project designed to train pre-service teachers at Utah State University to effectively integrate technology into their future classrooms. This presentation will address the process and outcomes of the PT3 project evaluation and emphasize two strands: the Portfolio Builder (tFolio) strand and The Young Educational Technology Center (YECT) Program strand. tFolio is a web application that helps pre-service teachers build an electronic portfolio. This program will be examined in terms of user-friendliness, efficiency, and effectiveness to provide formative feedback to its developers. In addition, a needs assessment will be conducted on the YETC program to provide baseline measures and proposed priorities for program improvement. This evaluation endeavor, based on the evaluation guidelines suggested in Dr. Elliot Eisner’s The Enlightened Eye (1990), will be reported in three parts: (1) Introduction of USU PT3 project; (2) Description of the two strands, and (3) Evaluation results.

Evaluation of The Technology for Reflection and Assessment Project
Presenters Mahnaz Moallem, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Cathy Barlow, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Conference Sessions: Thursday, November 7, 2002 – 3:20 pm to 4:50 pm

Presidential Strand

Roundtables: Presidential Strand Theme - Evaluation: A Systemic Process that Reforms Systems

Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 4:05 pm.

Roundtables Session 407 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair
To Be Announced

First Rotation – Table A: Plotting the Trajectory of an Evaluation Habit of Mind

Presenters
Steven Katz, University of Toronto
Stephanie Sutherland, University of Toronto
Lorna Earl, University of Toronto

Abstract
In an earlier paper (Katz, Sutherland & Earl, in press), we used the psychological lens of motivation to argue that mandated evaluation requirements can serve as the impetus for accountability to become synonymous with organizational improvement. Specifically, we offered evidence of how the use of data for wise decision-making finds intrinsically derived sustainability and becomes consolidated in an “evaluation habit of mind”. What was missing from this earlier work was a mapping of the trajectory by which this capacity develops. In this paper, we address this gap by chronicling a professional development initiative designed to promote the acquisition of an evaluation habit of mind within an educational context. We proceed to map the experiences of four of the participants as they journeyed towards an understanding of evidence informed decision-making. A combination of document analyses and exit interviews allowed us to plot the developmental course by which this evaluation mindset unfolds.

First Rotation – Table B: Generative Evaluation for Systemic Change of Teacher Education

Presenters
Mari Kemis, Iowa State University
Niki Davis, Iowa State University

Abstract
The purpose of the roundtable is to share our novel approach to evaluation of systemic change. Prompted by the national initiative to prepare tomorrow’s teachers to use technology, which requires simultaneous renewal of universities and K-12 schools, ISU is developing an evaluation model to examine and understand actions and reactions to change, including educational renewal through use of model. The model is based on Havlock and Zlotolow’s CREATER approach, which was designed to assist change agents. In addition, Bosserman’s views on renewal are incorporated into the model to provide a map of educational systems. Discussion will focus on (1) techniques used to build and verify the model through individual interviews with project leaders, (2) how structured interview questions for other project partners are generated, (3) identifying confounding and facilitating factors in changing systems of education, and (4) specific examples of change and renewal.

First Rotation – Table C: What Other Countries and States Teach Us About Building Comprehensive Initiatives that Stick!

Presenter
Barbara F Foster, The Policy Group for Florida’s Families and Children

Abstract
This session will provide a presentation of the latest work of The Policy Group for Florida’s Families and Children based on the experience of other states and countries and research on systems change. This presentation will share the findings of a study that juxtaposed the recommendations from the systems change literature with research on comprehensive child well-being programs in other nations and states that have shown success. This work revealed nine critical components for implementation of comprehensive initiatives. The process and findings will be the focus of this presentation.

First Rotation – Table D: Influencing the System from Within: Challenges for the Internal Evaluator

Presenters
Jennifer Coyne-Cassata, Fairfax County Public Schools
Stephanie K Siddens, Fairfax County Public Schools

Abstract
Internal evaluators face challenges inherent to their positions, including internal and external credibility, working within the power structure, and others. Sharing these challenges and developing strategies to address them can help evaluators shape the context of the system from within. In larger organizations, internal evaluators may be viewed as external to the organization by staff managing programs. Yet, many decision makers in the organization understand internal evaluators to be part of the organization and more easily contribute to decision-making about evaluations. This roundtable discussion will explore some challenges faced by internal evaluators, including a discussion of the pros and cons of internal evaluation, a description of illustrative cases, and a presentation of strategies for addressing the challenges. The presenters will provide participants with the opportunity to share experiences and discuss strategies and approaches for maintaining the integrity of evaluation while serving the mission of the organization.

First Rotation – Table E: Evaluating Environmental Programs: Systemic Challenges, Systemic Solutions?

Presenter
Michael A Jacobson, King County DNRP
Abstract Environmental program evaluation offers some unique challenges, such as a lack of scientific/policy consensus on how to define and measure "environmental health" or "sustainability" and no nationally integrated environmental baseline. Can we categorize what makes environmental programs systemically "resistant" to evaluation? Do we know what existing approaches and models from other fields (e.g., human services, education, research and development) can aid us in our evaluation efforts? Can we specify what components of environmental programs are truly unique and propose some common approaches for addressing these areas? This roundtable will address these questions by: highlighting structural issues that make environmental programs especially challenging for evaluation; discussing relevant "lessons learned" from evaluations in other topical areas; and coming to an understanding of those elements that are truly unique and collaborating on evaluation approaches to address these issues. Participants are urged to share "best practice" examples of environmental program evaluations.

First Rotation - Table F: Evaluation of Industry and Regional Assistance in New Zealand

Presenters: Amir Pirich, Ministry of Economic Development
           Olga Berezovsky, Ministry of Economic Development

Abstract: The evaluation of industry and regional assistance programmes in New Zealand is undertaken within an evaluation framework. This evaluation framework was established in 2000/2001 as a range of new industry and regional development programmes were introduced by the Government. The paper will describe the evaluation framework, the broader systemic context in which it has been developed, lessons learnt in implementing the framework, as well as early results. A feature of this framework is that it is organised around enablers of Government's high level outcomes for industry and regional assistance, which are improved access to: resources and infrastructure, advice and information on opportunities, skills and management capabilities, innovation and new technologies, finance; improvements in the regulatory and business environment; and supporting an enterprise culture.

First Rotation - Table G: National Evaluations as Decentralized Governing: The Institutionalization of Evaluations in the Swedish Higher Education System

Presenters: Christina Segerholm, Umeå University
           Eva B Astrom, National Agency for Higher Education

Abstract: Institutionalized national evaluations of Swedish higher education will be discussed as a means to govern a newly decentralized public system. Drawing on Foucault and his successors, evaluation can be regarded as a technology of management that is disseminated in society by a particular rationality of governance. Such governance is an unfixed construction that rests on independent 'nodes' like institutions and agencies. The public national evaluations can be understood as this kind of 'node' to which power and government can be attached. The access to independent expertise is especially important in rendering this technology scientific reliability. The evaluator/expert establishes a formalized (market) relation between the parts and actors of the system, and legitimizes public governing by rendering it an air of scientific objectivity. In the neo-liberal, new public management and decentralized context, evaluations and educational policy are mutually conditioned.

Second Rotation - Table A: Evaluation of Systems Change Needed for Successful Strategic Planning

Presenter: Nicole Catapano, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract: To prepare for implementation of a strategic plan, organizations need to evaluate the systems change required to move successfully through the strategic planning process. Because the process of planning is dynamic and may be initiated through one of many change models, it is important to evaluate the process using an approach designed to assess both the process and the outcomes. Using the "3I Model for Evaluating Systems Change", this paper summarizes the initiation and implementation phases of systems change for planning processes in a non-profit organization. Implications for other settings and suggestions for evaluating the impact phase are presented.

Second Rotation - Table B: Systemic Reform in Education and Systemic Evaluation

Presenters: Nancy S Lewis, University of Central Florida
            Letha Silas, University of Central Florida
            Elizabeth Hoffman, University of Central Florida

Abstract: The Lockheed Martin/UCF Academy, which began in 1992, is a master's degree program for teachers of grades K-8 to enhance mathematics, science, and technology education. Program goals are to provide for the environment, challenge, and enriched theoretical and practical context of education where inquiry and collaboration are the catalysts for leadership and change in mathematical and science education. The program's design is consistent with national curriculum, instruction, assessment, and teacher preparation standards. Moreover, the LMA supports the creation of a network for school-based leadership in mathematics and science education. Partly due to its sustainability, NSF funded a 4-year, longitudinal evaluation of LMA impact. This presentation describes the LMA and the role of its evaluation as part of a systemic reform initiative.

Second Rotation - Table C: Promoting Systems Change Through Transformative Evaluation

Presenters: Pennie G Foster-Fishman, Michigan State University
Cheryl Rosaen, Michigan State University  
Frank Fear, Michigan State University  
Marguerite Barratt, Michigan State University  
Hiriam Fitzgerald, Michigan State University

Abstract  This roundtable will explore how to conduct evaluations that lead to collective action in support of democratic ideals, social reform and systemic change. We will first present our emerging model for transformative evaluation, a framework based upon an in-depth analysis of a diverse array of projects that successfully achieved such change. This model includes four transforming dynamics: promoting discovery through discourse, enhancing connectivity via social embeddedness, developing inclusiveness through authentic processes, and promoting responsive action through continuous learning. The processes and norms developed to foster and maintain these dynamics, the valued outcomes they produced, the systemic factors influencing their implementation, and the challenges encountered will also be discussed. Participants will be invited to participate in a learning community where they will explore the transforming dynamics within their own evaluation work.

Second Rotation – Table D: Systemic Effect of Evaluation on One Elementary School
Presenters  Imelda R Castaneda, University of Cincinnati  
Marco Pangallo, Heritage Elementary School
Abstract  This paper presents the systemic effect of the evaluation of an arts-integrated program on one elementary school in Southwest Ohio. This school has been involved with the program since 1997. Using a collaborative and participatory approach, the evaluator involved the school administrator and teachers in the program evaluation. After more than three years into the program, improvements in different aspects of the organization are evident. Teachers become more focused on learning goals. There has been unprecedented collaboration in the school. Teachers are drawing on the expertise of people with different roles in the organization, something that has not been true for the school before. There has been improved communications within the organization. Master scheduling has been adjusted so there could be common time for teachers to plan during the day. There has been increased support for non-traditional classes, student-oriented, and student-led activities. Students and parents are excited about the program.

Second Rotation – Table E: Evaluating Systems Change: Towards a Theory-based Model
Presenters  Ash Vasudeva, WestEd  
Roger J D Chesswas, WestEd
Abstract  This roundtable highlights the strategies, challenges, and implications of an evaluation of a large-scale federally funded educational research and development program. The evaluation - designed to formatively influence the program as well as provide summative findings - examines the systems-level impact of four major program initiatives in standards and accountability, school leadership, teacher quality, and building strong communities. The roundtable offers insight into how evaluation theory informs, and is informed by, the development and implementation of an evaluation that seeks to capture finely focused and broadly diffused systems-level impacts of multiple reform initiatives over time. In particular, the roundtable will address the specific theoretical challenges posed by systems-level evaluations, and how working with researchers and practitioners can help evaluators respond to, refine, and improve theory.

Second Rotation – Table F: Transforming a Foundation into a Learning Organization
Presenters  Pauline E Brooks, The California Endowment  
Astrid Hendricks-Smith, The California Endowment  
Rhonda M Ortiz, The California Endowment
Abstract  The purpose of this roundtable is to discuss and examine the role that an Evaluation Department within a major health care foundation plays in transforming that foundation into a learning institution. The discussion highlights the varied efforts of a young foundation set within the culturally diverse state of California, and how it attempts to evolve into a learning foundation while pioneering a multicultural health approach to grantmaking. The foundation serves culturally diverse, underserved communities, and funds community based efforts tackling long-standing health problems. The Evaluation Department has embarked on a path to rigorously study and feed back findings on these programs in order to re-shape and significantly refine strategic programming within this large foundation.

Conference Committee Strand
You Can’t Push a String: Using Performance and Evaluation Indicators to Develop Common Vision and Ownership of Objectives by Diverse Players in Complex Systems
Panel Session 398 to be held in Ballroom F  
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Measuring Multiple Levels of Systems Change: The Case of Family Connection
Presenter: James G Emshoff, Georgia State University

Evaluation Through Community Participation: The Community Health Improvement Measurement and Evaluation System (CHIMES)
Presenter: Sue Pickens, Parkland Health and Hospital System

Is Systematic Evaluation Worth the Effort? Evaluating California's Tuberculosis Indicators Project
Presenters: Maureen Wilce, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Tambi Shaw, California Department of Health Services

TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions
The Storied Nature of Evaluation: A Conversation
Panel Session 397 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG
Chair: Robert E Stake, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Session Abstract: This panel is a report on a conversation among the authors centered on their shared interest in alternative methods of inquiry and evaluation in agriculture. Central to their discussion is an exploration of the parallels between the paradigm shift that occurred in evaluation in the early 1980s and the current paradigmatic shift being promoted by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. In the course of this conversational paper the authors suggest that evaluators must cultivate their capacity to hear and tell stories. From this perspective the evaluation report is no longer an attempt to mirror reality, rather it is an evocative story that asks the reader to engage the story line morally, emotionally, aesthetically and intellectually. It is our hope this paper will serve as what Patti Lather has called an “incitement to discourse” in the disciplinary fields of evaluation and agriculture.
Presenters: Yvonna Lincoln, Texas A&M University
Laurie Thorp, Michigan State University
Craig Russon, WK Kellogg Foundation

Business Meeting and Presentation: Closing out Contracts - Getting Feedback From Clients & Colleagues
Business Meeting Session 399 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG
TIG Leaders: Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates
Christina Olenik Lynch, Partners in Evaluation & Planning
Maryann Durland, Durland Consulting Inc
Session Chair: Jean Haley, Haley-McGuiness Consulting Group
Discussants: Kathleen A Dowell, Partners in Evaluation & Planning LLC
Jo Ann Doino-Ingersoll, Strategic Research
Julie W Chambliss, Chambliss & Associates Inc

Fighting Child Labor: How Evaluation Is Helping
Panel Session 400 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair: Michael Hendricks, Independent Consultant
Discussant: Michael Hendricks, Independent Consultant
Session Abstract: Evaluation is helping to fight child labor around the world. Whether children are packing fireworks, working in mines, trafficking drugs, fighting in armies, or serving as prostitutes, all forms of child labor are abhorrent. The International Labour Office (ILO) of the United Nations and the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) are collaborating to fight child labor, and evaluation is one of their key tools. They benefit from the expertise of Management Systems International (MSI), an experienced consulting firm. Together, these three organizations are using evaluation to incorporate good practices into project designs, to improve projects being implemented, to assess the impacts of projects fully operational, and to generate valuable lessons for others working against child labor. This session offers the head of the ILO’s child labor evaluation unit, a high-level political appointee from DOL, a senior
The cross-site evaluation covers impacts of standards-based, inquiry centered, technologically supported, science and mathematics courses for all implementation and use of M&E systems. Their experience offers an instructive case study of institutional collaboration centered on the development, management and reporting functions. This close collaboration both presents difficulties and offers opportunities, in terms of technical and methodological aspects. Organizations may work together to design and install M&E systems to meet their own needs (including external reporting) and to provide information to their managers. However, making M&E systems operational often involves working with partner organizations. In some cases, this interaction is quite narrow and centers around the collection of data. In other circumstances, the partnership between organizations is much more substantial. For example, organizations may work together to design and install M&E systems to inform both organizations' management and reporting functions. This close collaboration both presents difficulties and offers opportunities, in terms of technical and methodological aspects of M&E systems. Experience offers an instructive case study of institutional collaboration centered on the development, implementation and use of M&E systems.

**System-wide Reform in K-12 Mathematics and Science Education**

**MultiPaper Session 401 to be held in the Potomac I room**

**Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**

Darnella Davis, COSMOS Corporation

**Cross-site Evaluation of the Urban Systemic Program**

**Presenter**

Robert K Yin, COSMOS Corporation

**Abstract**

This presentation will focus on the findings and lessons learned from the ongoing cross-site evaluation of the Urban Systemic Program (USP). The cross-site evaluation covers impacts of standards-based, inquiry centered, technologically supported, science and mathematics courses for all organizations. Yet the actual identification, sharing and use of knowledge about what works or not is all too rare. How can evaluation assist in this process? The International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Office (ILO) is using evaluation to enable learning from experience and the application of the knowledge for the development of policies and practices as well as to provide evidence-based guidance for others working to combat child labour. IPEC's evaluation approaches include documenting outcomes and impact with a focus on understanding and providing information about what has worked and why; thematic evaluations to identify what works across a number of different contexts; framework for identifying, documenting, sharing and applying good practices; and increasing competence in evaluation, and in "thinking evaluatively", among staff and partners. The author thanks Florencio Gudiño and Burt Perrin for their help on earlier versions of this presentation.

**Department of Labor's Use of Evaluation to Help Eliminate Child Labor and Promote Core Labor Standards**

**Presenter**

Michael Magan, US Department of Labor

**Abstract**

The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), is actively engaged in supporting technical assistance projects around the world to eliminate child labor and promote labor standards both bilaterally and through the work of the International Labor Office (ILO). Over time, ILAB has worked to enhance the reliability of its performance measures and the use of performance data to accurately reflect program results. This has been accomplished through increasing frequency of reporting, enhancing indicators, and emphasis on mid-term and final evaluations. ILAB-supported projects have used a number of indicators to monitor and evaluate progress achieved. Some involve data that can be readily quantified, such as: in the case of child labor projects—children withdrawn or prevented from involvement in exploitative labor, or provided with educational alternatives to child labor; and in the case of labor standards—the number of collective bargaining agreements that incorporate worker rights, or the number of labor inspectors trained to enforce labor laws. ILAB has worked to refine other indicators that are needed to capture more qualitative outcomes, such as the building of local capacity to address child labor and ensure adherence to labor standards. This presentation will focus on (1) how USDOL-ILAB has improved its mechanisms for tracking performance; (2) how USDOL has worked to refine and develop new indicators to capture progress achieved through less-easily quantified activities; and (3) the innovative and collaborative process by which USDOL-ILAB and the ILO have worked together to improve the ability of each to track performance.

**Two Steps Forward, One Step Back: Helping the International Labour Office and Department of Labor Collaborate on Measurement & Evaluation Systems Design and Implementation**

**Presenter**

Keith Brown, Management Systems International

**Abstract**

Institutions plan, monitor and evaluate in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of their programs and to communicate and collaborate with partners and stakeholders. Generally speaking, institutions design monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to meet their own needs (including external reporting) and to provide information to their managers. However, making M&E systems operational often involves working with partner organizations. In some cases, this interaction is quite narrow and centers around the collection of data. In other circumstances, the partnership between organizations is much more substantial. For example, organizations may work together to design and install M&E systems to inform both organizations’ management and reporting functions. This close collaboration both presents difficulties and offers opportunities, in terms of technical and methodological aspects of M&E systems. Experience and the application of the knowledge for the development of policies and practices as well as to provide evidence-based guidance for others working to combat child labour. IPEC's evaluation approaches include documenting outcomes and impact with a focus on understanding and providing information about what has worked and why; thematic evaluations to identify what works across a number of different contexts; framework for identifying, documenting, sharing and applying good practices; and increasing competence in evaluation, and in "thinking evaluatively", among staff and partners. The author thanks Florencio Gudiño and Burt Perrin for their help on earlier versions of this presentation.

**How Evaluation At The International Labour Office Contributes to Policy and Practices That Are Based Upon Evidence About What Is Effective and Why**

**Presenter**

Peter E Wichmand, International Labour Organisation

**Abstract**

There is increasing recognition about the importance of knowledge management and a learning approach to the effectiveness of any organisation. Yet the actual identification, sharing and use of knowledge about what works or not is all too rare. How can evaluation assist in this process? The International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Office (ILO) is using evaluation to enable learning from experience and the application of the knowledge for the development of policies and practices as well as to provide evidence-based guidance for others working to combat child labour. IPEC's evaluation approaches include documenting outcomes and impact with a focus on understanding and providing information about what has worked and why; thematic evaluations to identify what works across a number of different contexts; framework for identifying, documenting, sharing and applying good practices; and increasing competence in evaluation, and in "thinking evaluatively", among staff and partners. The author thanks Florencio Gudiño and Burt Perrin for their help on earlier versions of this presentation.
students among three cohorts of grantees that have received funding from NSFÆs USP program. Preliminary findings are based on data being collected over the course of the five-year study. The discussion will address how the cross-site evaluation is using qualitative and quantitative outcome data to gauge the progress of system-wide reforms. The presenter will comment on the role this evaluation will play in the systemic reform of evaluation, how a metric for gauging reform is being utilized, and how the lessons from this study can be used in future evaluation designs.

**Studying Statewide Systemic Reforming**

**Presenter** Norman Gold, COSMOS Corporation

**Overview of the Trajectory of the National Science Foundation's Educational Reform Initiatives**

**Presenter** Bernice T Anderson, National Science Foundation

---

**Innovative Approaches to Evaluating Substance Abuse Treatment Programs**

MultiPaper Session 402 to be held in the Potomac II room

Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG

**Chair** Scott B Crosse, Westat

**Client Tracking: A Practical Approach for Special Populations**

**Presenters** Saul M Levin, Access Consulting International Inc
Karl Poonai, Access Consulting International Inc

**Abstract** The Beacon Project, a 12-month substance abuse treatment program funded by CSAT, is an innovative model integrating the criminal justice system, faith-based treatment providers, and local government services. The goal of the program is to provide a continuum of care, including pre-treatment, residential treatment, and aftercare services, to incarcerated men in an effort to break the recurring cycle of substance abuse and incarceration. Data collected from graduates show the programÆs success in decreasing recidivism rates and improving socio-economic factors including employment status. However, 53% of clients have left treatment prior to successful completion. This low retention rate has introduced challenges to project staff regarding client tracking. The evaluation team has developed innovative strategies to facilitate tracking and follow-up for this hard-to-reach population. The paper will present several implement approaches that have improved client tracking results. Recommendations will be offered on practices that can be employed for successful client tracking.

**Using Drug-user Generated Outcomes of Progress to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Harm Reduction**

**Presenters** Susan J Rogers, Academy for Educational Development
Terry Ruefli, New York Harm Reduction Educators Incorporated

**Abstract** Harm reduction is controversial model for treating drug users with little formal research on its operation and effectiveness. In order to advance the field, we first conducted participatory research with 120 clients using nominal group technique to develop culturally relevant outcomes to measure program progress. Second, we conducted focus group interviews with a different group of 120 clients to help validate the outcomes. Third, we used the outcomes in an evaluation of a large harm reduction program with a representative sample of 260 who completed a baseline and an average of 7 follow-up assessments over a year. The participatory research resulted in outcomes of 10 life areas important to drug users. The evaluation results showed that the program positively impacted clients across all the outcomes with the strongest impact shown in outcomes most directly addressed in the program and among clients who received more program dosage. Results also demonstrated that client progress was not linear but dependent on the extent to which drug use was more stable rather than chaotic.

**Clients' Perceptions of the Results of Their Treatment as Outcome Indicators**

**Presenters** Céline Mercier, McGill University
Michel Landry, Alternatives Domremy-Montreal Prefontaine
Michel Perreault, McGill University
Marc Corbiere, Douglas Hospital Research Centre/McGill

**Abstract** In the context of the development of a continuing quality evaluation system, an addiction rehabilitation centre developed a questionnaire that looked at the changes as perceived by clients following a treatment. The questionnaire was administered to 200 clients, who also participated in an outcome study with a six-month follow-up. The results of the outcome study were compared to the survey data in order to assess the questionnaire criterion validity. In addition to presenting the study design and its findings, this paper aims to discuss a more general issue: in light of the current interest in clients' point of view in the reform of services, the time has come to develop valid instruments for measuring results as perceived by clients and to integrate the data into the Monitoring Systems of Treatment Outcomes.

**For Whom Did the Program Work? Applications of Latent Class Growth Models in Substance Abuse Research**
Presenter: Sanjeev Sridharan, Westat

Abstract: One of the assumptions that often explicitly and implicitly made in longitudinal evaluations in substance abuse research is that program effects are assumed to be homogenous across the population. The sub-groups for whom the program was especially effective often do not often get identified. In this presentation, we use empirically-driven strategies to identify classes of individuals who responded to targeted programs differentially over time. General Growth Mixture Models (GGMM) will be implemented to identify latent trajectory classes – these are models that integrate both latent class with growth models (See Muthen and Muthen, 2000). Data from the Children-at-Risk (Harrell et al, 1999) and the Opportunity-to-Succeed projects (Rossman et al, 1999) will be used to implement the latent class growth models. Multi-wave data are available in both of these projects. The following domains will be used in the analysis: drug use, type of treatment, social networks, family risks and criminal behaviors.

---


Panel Session 403 to be held in the Potomac III room

Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG

Chair: Frederick L Newman, Florida International University
Discussant: Chip Reichardt, University of Denver
Presenter: William R Shadish, University of Memphis

Session Abstract: Following in the tradition of Campbell and Stanley (1963) and Cook and Campbell (1979), this last year saw the publication of Shadish, Cook and Campbell's (2002) Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Generalized Causal Inference (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin). This brief talk will include comments on the significant similarities and differences between the new book and its predecessor works, including minor revisions to the validity typology, extensive coverage of theoretical and practical problems in randomized experiments, chapter length coverage of the regression discontinuity design, and the theory of generalized causal inference outlined in three chapters of this book. It will also discuss the larger context in which this book fits in (a) program evaluation in general, and (b) the larger literature on the design and analysis of experimental and observational studies. The comments will be relatively brief to allow much time for discussion.

---

Empowerment Evaluation: Principles, Conceptual Schema, and Practice

Panel Session 404 to be held in the Potomac V room

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

Chair: David Fetterman, Stanford University
Discussant: Susan Labin, Temple University

Session Abstract: Empowerment evaluation is reaching another conceptual plateau in its development. This panel ponders principles, schema, and practice. A set of principles for the theory and practice of empowerment evaluation are briefly presented and organized into 3 categories. The first category consists of core values that are central to the philosophy and practice of empowerment evaluation. The second category focuses on the creation of a culture that is ready and interested in improvement. The third category illuminates how EE is a cyclical and developmental process. This conceptualization of empowerment evaluation is followed by a conceptual schema of the cycle of prevention research and practice which points out the utility of the EE approach in connecting research to practice. Finally, the third presentation builds on this theme by linking money to community and practice. This is accomplished by drawing on a $5 million Hewlett Foundation effort to revitalize an historically low-income, disenfranchised city in the heart of Silicon Valley.

Empowerment Evaluation: A Set of Principles

Presenters: Abraham Wandersman, University of South Carolina
            Dana Keener, University of South Carolina
            Jessica Snell-Johns, University of South Carolina
            Paul Flaspohler, University of South Carolina
            Melanie Dye, University of South Carolina
            Julia Mendez, University of South Carolina

Abstract: Although empowerment evaluation is relatively new (almost a decade old), it has gained acceptance in mainstream evaluation circles. Since the publication of the seminal work on empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, Kaftarian & Wandersman, 1996), much work has been done in the name of empowerment evaluation. In addition to scholarly contributions and a plethora of empowerment evaluations conducted in numerous communities, the creation and establishment of the American Evaluation Association's Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation topical interest group has...
also provided fertile ground for extended debate and discussion about the EE approach. The purpose of this discussion is to propose a set of principles for the theory and practice of empowerment evaluation. The principles represent EE’s stance on ideology and practice and are organized into three categories. In Table 1, we present an initial attempt at defining and categorizing the principles. The first category consists of core values that are central to the philosophy and practice of empowerment evaluation. The second category consists of principles that pertain to creating a culture that is ready and interested in improvement. The third category includes principles that illuminate how EE is a cyclical and developmental process. It is important to note that (1) these principles represent ideals, (2) these individual principles are not exclusively associated with empowerment evaluation, and (3) it is the set of principles taken as a whole, which distinguishes EE from other approaches.

**Empowerment Evaluation in the Cycle of Prevention Research and Practice**

**Presenters**
- Shakeh Kaftarian, National Institute on Drug Abuse
- Elizabeth Robertson, National Institute on Drug Abuse

**Abstract**
Over the past 25 years the field of drug abuse prevention has demonstrated the efficacy and effectiveness of a number of prevention strategies. Currently NIDA is promoting services and systems research on effective prevention strategies in order to explicate processes and mechanisms which are important in the successful practice of these research-based strategies through service programs. Presenters will discuss a conceptual schema which defines the cycle of prevention research and practice, and points out the utility of the EE approach in connecting research to practice. They will: 1) define stages of prevention research in terms of basic research; efficacy research; small-scale effectiveness research; large-scale effectiveness research; services research; and systems research; 2) define stages of prevention practice in terms of services planning, services delivery, services evaluation and services sustainability; 3) discuss interconnections between stages of research and practice; and 4) discuss the utility of Empowerment Evaluation in incorporating science into practice.

**Empowerment Evaluation, $5 Million, and a Low Income Community: What Are We Learning in Principle and Practice?**

**Presenter**
- David Fetterman, Stanford University

**Abstract**
The Hewlett Foundation has funded a $5 million dollar effort to revitalize a low income community in the heart of Silicon Valley. An empowerment evaluation approach has been adopted to facilitate change and assess performance over time. The logic of evaluation was discussed and presented in the community highlighting the relationship between programs, processes, outcomes, and impacts. The nature of program theory was explored in order to focus attention on critical program components. However, the heart of the effort was epitomized by empowerment evaluation workshops, which focused on: 1) developing a mission; 2) taking stock; and 3) planning for the future. Theories of use and action were helpful in clarifying expectations and moving the initiative forward. The tensions between members of the community, such as Latinos and African-Americans, surfaced at various junctures in the effort. The use of data, such as demographic data helped to explain some of these dynamics and shifts in the population. Larger issues emerged concerning what it means to be Black. Similar tensions emerged between the funder and the managing partners. The significance of scaffolding and building a capacity building infrastructure in order to produce specified outcomes and long-term impacts proved helpful in keeping the team focused and united.

**The Future for Non-profit and Foundation Evaluation: A Systemic Linkage of Program Evaluation and Organizational Development**

**Panel Session 405 to be held in the Potomac VI room**

**Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Charles McClintock, Fielding Graduate Institute

**Session Abstract**
Systemic reform in evaluation for non-profits and foundations requires approaches that integrate principles and practices of program evaluation and organizational development ũ two complementary professional fields that operate largely independent of one another. Where evaluation emphasizes dealing with data, organizational development highlights working with people and structures. Both are essential for productive organizational change. This panel will examine standards, principles and practices from these two fields to identify areas of overlap as well as differential skill sets and emphases. Goals of organizational development emphasize facilitating processes that promote meaning, value, and benefit for individuals who are members and recipients of organizational activity. Goals of program evaluation include assessing program merit and improving the quality of organizational efforts to accomplish intended goals. Goals of integrated approaches would facilitate evaluative inquiry and program change that improve performance and generate learning that is both internal and external to the organization.

**Scholar-practitioner Change Agents: A Professional Model for Organizational Evaluation**

**Presenter**
- Charles McClintock, Fielding Graduate Institute

**Abstract**
The presenters will discuss the theoretical and value-based assumptions that underlie Organizational Evaluation, and propose a new set of standards that incorporate the existing Program Evaluation Standards (Utility, Feasibility, Propriety and Accuracy) with commonly accepted standards for
OD practitioners. The authors will describe the role of a scholar-practitioner who facilitates organizational change based on empirical evidence and theory - system theory, organizational change theory and specific program intervention theory. The skill set required of a scholar-practitioner involved in program evaluation will be discussed as part of the standards for engaging in effective organizational evaluation.

Building Commitment and Capacity for Evaluation Among Community-based Organizations
Presenter: Martha Campbell, The James Irvine Foundation
Abstract: Many community-based organizations experience evaluation as a control mechanism applied by funders to make sure that grantees did what they said they would do. Consequently, service providers have focused on compliance rather than results and have been rewarded for doing paperwork rather than making a difference in clients’ lives. Evaluation is a test that service providers need to pass, rather than an opportunity to learn and improve. In 1998, The James Irvine Foundation adopted an evaluation strategy and approach that focuses on improvement and effectiveness. Drawing from the experience of the Irvine Foundation in promoting the use of evaluation among its grantees, the presenter will discuss strategies and lessons in developing the evaluation capacity of community-based organizations and the challenges of creating organizational cultures that value the process of evaluation, including examining assumptions, collecting data to test those assumptions empirically, and deliberately reflecting and acting on the findings.

Organizational Evaluation and Organizational Evaluation Interventions in Foundations
Presenter: Keith Melville, Kettering Foundation/Fielding Graduate Institute
Abstract: Foundations have long engaged in program evaluation as a means of assessing grant-making activities. In recent years, such activities have taken on greater importance, and program officers responsible for evaluation have been asked to perform a larger, more complex task. Drawing on his experience in the foundation world, the presenter will describe how and why that role has changed, and how the function of evaluation in foundations can be improved by supplementing the evaluator’s role with perspectives and approaches more closely associated with OD practice. At a time of increased emphasis on accountability in the non-profit world, evaluation activities initiated by foundations need to enhance their grantees’ practice and organizational effectiveness, while also permitting grant-makers to assess their effectiveness. This presentation will examine new roles for those engaged in program evaluation to enable them to meet these twin goals.

OD practitioners in the Corporate World: Implications for Enhancing the Effectiveness of Non-profit Organizations
Presenter: Eileen Morgan, Morgan Kayhoe Inc.
Abstract: Drawing on her experience as a senior OD consultant to corporations and business enterprises, the presenter will reflect on parallels between for-profit and non-profit organizations in their efforts to assess and enhance organizational effectiveness. She will describe the evolution in the corporate world from reliance on analytic and quantitative assessments such as ROI (return on investment) to more organic assessments of organizational learning and the emergence of effective knowledge management within corporate cultures. A key role of OD professionals is to help organizations translate into use the information that results from these newer forms of self-assessment. The presenter will explore specific OD skills and interventions, commonly used in corporate settings that are promising ways to help non-profit organizations adapt to new situations and function more effectively.

Panel Session 406 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Chair: Ellen L. Konrad, RMC Research Corporation
Session Abstract: The Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) is the federal government’s new system of evaluation of state child welfare programs. The CFSR focuses on assessing a state’s performance on child welfare outcomes related to safety, permanency, and child and family well-being, as well as the systemic factors that support achievement of those outcomes. This panel examines the ability of the Child and Family Review evaluation system to reform child welfare programs from the perspectives of the federal agency implementing the evaluation process, a state agency that has been reviewed, and a child welfare evaluator external to the review process.

Child and Family Services Review: A Federal Perspective
Presenter: William Hornsby, US Department of Health and Human Services
Abstract: This presentation will explain the background, purpose and methodology of the Child and Family Review process. It will present the lessons learned about the effectiveness of state child welfare programs from its initial round of reviews in states that participated during the first review cycle. In addition, this presentation will describe what the federal government learned about the CFSR as an evaluation system and what modifications were needed after initial implementation.

Strengths of the CFSR and Areas Needing Improvement: A State Perspective
Presenter: Jules M Marquart, Tennessee Department of Children’s Services
Abstract: This presenter provides the state perspective from having coordinated the CFSR process for her state agency as well as having participated in other state's CFSR reviews. She will apply the federal approach of describing strengths and needs to an analysis of the Child and Family Reviews. The presentation will focus on philosophical, methodological and practical issues in conducting the CFSR.

Measurement Issues in the Child and Family Services Review Process

Presenter: Charles L Usher, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Abstract: The CFSR process attempts to build on data compiled under the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) mandated by the federal government. Limitations in AFCARS compromise the validity and reliability of performance measures being used in the review process. The manner in which indicators are measured also makes it difficult for them to capture improvements or declines in performance. This presentation will describe some of the most important problems and identify some ways in which the process could be enhanced using data compiled under AFCARS and collected through on-site case reviews.

Evaluation: Value-added in Indian/Indigenous Communities

Panel Session 408 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

Chair: Jane Grover, RMC Research Corporation

Session Abstract: Evaluators working in American Indian and other indigenous communities often face a number of challenges. Examples include mediating program goals when multiple funders are involved, bridging the gap between being an "outsider" and needing to gain the trust of program staff and participants, as well as making required evaluations for outside funders useful and interesting to the program staff and community. This panel of experienced First Nations evaluators will discuss these challenges and describe ways in which their evaluations have addressed cultural and programmatic challenges to add value for indigenous communities.

Empowering a Tribal College Multi-disciplinary Learning Program Through Evaluation

Presenter: Joan LaFrance, Mekinak Consulting

Abstract: Tribal control over their own educational institutions is relatively new. Many tribal schools and colleges are experimenting with different approaches to curriculum and instruction. A number of these programs are creating new and exciting knowledge, however, given the resistance in most tribal communities to being "researched" there is little academic opportunity to document and publish important new learning. Program evaluation can fill this gap. Evaluators can capture the theory implicit in the program's design and document how the hypothesis underlying the theory is being tested. This presentation will discuss how an evaluation of a multi-disciplinary, learning community program in a tribal college is creating exciting new knowledge and changing perceptions of instructors and administrators about the structure of instruction at the institution.

Nine-year Programmatic Activities for a Bridge Program Entitled: Bridges to American Indian Students at Community Colleges

Presenter: Priscilla Marquez, New Mexico State University at Las Cruces

Abstract: The National Institute of Health (NIH) funded a Bridge to American Indian Students at Community Colleges Program at New Mexico State University, Las Cruces in October 1992. The Bridge Program was one of the original seven Bridge to Baccalaureate Programs funded by the MORE Program of NIGMS at NIH. The original proposal included a collaborative effort with regional tribal community colleges that had combined enrollments of about 3,000 American Indian students who were citizens of nineteen different Pueblo communities and two major tribes (Navajo and Apache). As a result after nine years of funding through September 2001, 63% of the participants have transferred to a four-year baccalaureate institution and 26% of these transfers have now completed baccalaureate degrees, 8 students have completed master's degrees, and 4 students are enrolled in Ph.D. programs in the basic sciences. This presentation summarizes the evaluation efforts for ten major Bridge Program activities.

Process Evaluation in CSAT's American Indian Community Planning Grant for Greater Portland, Oregon

Presenter: Jane Grover, RMC Research Corporation

Abstract: Evaluating the process of developing collaborative efforts to improve substance abuse treatment in urban American Indian agencies presents unique challenges. These challenges have increased as competing bureaucratic priorities and regulations come into play at a boarding school serving American Indian high school students in the Northwest. Two Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) Grants have provided partial resources toward the goal of planning and implementing a program to meet the behavioral health needs of the nearly 90% of the student body needing such services. This presentation will address the evaluation model implemented, the data collection process, findings to date. It will also discuss the role of the evaluation in empowering the collaborating stakeholders to identify and address their own areas of resistance as well as systemic blocks to developing an alcohol education and treatment program to meet student needs.

Using Evaluation to Empower Improvement of a Province-wide First Nations Children's Program
Following a path of continual growth and development is engrained in the teachings of many First Nations. It is a documented fact that many indigenous professionals choose to dedicate their lives to the improvement of the socio-economic status of their people; many go into social work as a profession. For some, program design and/or supports may prohibit their ability to ultimately reach this goal. Ideally evaluations fill this gap. However, it is often left up to the organization to figure out how to actually implement the evaluation recommendations. This presentation examines the success story of an off-reserve province-wide First Nations children’s programme. Many recommendations were made as part the programme’s first evaluation. When the same consulting group conducted a second evaluation, the programme had implemented many, if not all the feasible recommendations of the initial evaluation. The evaluators were able to measure the growth and improvement of projects throughout the province. The factors surrounding this success will be discussed.
Abstract Initiated in 1999, the CMHS/CSAT Homeless Families Initiative is a two-phase, multi-site program designed to test and evaluate the effectiveness of time-limited mental health, substance abuse, and trauma treatment interventions for homeless mothers with psychiatric and/or substance use disorders who are caring for their dependent children. A cross-site evaluation of the study site interventions is being facilitated by a Coordinating Center working collaboratively with all sites, the federal government, and a Consumer Panel. This presentation will briefly highlight the commonalities and differences among the eight participating project sites in the Initiative. Challenges to a cross-site analysis strategy presented by the diversity of sites and study populations will be discussed. Efforts underway to identify and measure common intervention ingredients across the sites will be described, particularly in how they may permit pooling data across different subsets of sites.

A Preliminary Study of the Relationship Between Spirituality, Religious Practices and Readiness Recovery Among Homeless Women

Presenters Michael S Shafer, University of Arizona
Margaret Lubke, Utah State University
Marcie J Bober, San Diego State University

Abstract Repeatedly, the role of spirituality and acknowledgement of a “higher authority” has been recognized as a critical variable in the recovery of persons with addictive disorders and/or psychiatric impairments. Indeed, the value of spirituality as an intervention variable has been recently recognized by the Federal government and represents one of the driving forces behind the current administration’s “faith-based initiative”. In this presentation, we will describe a site specific study, as part of the Homeless Families initiative, to explore the role of spirituality in the lives of homeless women with psychiatric and/or substance abuse difficulties and to evaluate the relative influence of expressed spirituality upon women’s recover readiness. Utilizing both cross-site and site-specific data collected at baseline, this presentation will summarize preliminary correlational and factor analysis results. Preliminary findings on the analyses and the utilization of these findings to inform planned outcomes analyses will be presented.

Assessing the TCU Process Model in the Family & Aftercare Model Evaluation

Presenters Frank S Pearson, National Development and Research Institutes Incorporated
JoAnn Y Sacks, National Development and Research Institutes Incorporated
Carrie Coen, National Development and Research Institutes Incorporated
Sharon Birckett, National Development and Research Institutes Incorporated
Stanely Sacks, National Development and Research Institutes Incorporated

Abstract As one of the site-specific studies in the Homeless Families initiative, NDRI is conducting a quasi-experiment on Gaudenzi’s therapeutic communities for mothers with substance abuse problems to evaluate Family & Aftercare Model (FAM) program enhancements: providing trauma recovery therapy and housing case assistance. This FAM study has adapted Simpson’s TCU Process Model (based on prior research) as a causal model of the processes operating in FAM. FAM’s specific hypotheses include: (1) client attributes (e.g., motivation) and program characteristics at baseline affect both therapeutic alliance and treatment progress at the 3-month (in treatment) follow-up; (2) therapeutic alliance affects treatment progress at 3-month follow-up; (3) therapeutic alliance and treatment progress at 3 months in treatment each affect both treatment retention/completion and hypothesized outcomes (both measured at 9 month follow-up); (4) therapeutic alliance and treatment retention/completion affect hypothesized post-treatment outcomes (measured at 15 months). Preliminary findings on the Process Model are discussed.


Business Meeting Session 411 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG

Obtaining Essential, Systemic Evaluation Data Using Geographic Information Systems and United States Census 2000

TIG Leaders Mark I Bober, San Diego State University
Margaret Lubke, Utah State University

Presenter Morris K Lai, University of Hawaii

Abstract An integrated approach using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software and U.S. Census 2000 can yield substantial improvement in the collecting, organizing, analyzing, and presenting of essential, systemic evaluation data, particularly in the education area. After school catchment boundaries are drawn, data can be linked and displayed geographically (e.g., school’s location, enrollment, population centers, other institutions), using Census 2000 data (e.g., income, race/ethnicity, home language, household size, whether own or rent home), and school data (e.g., test scores, absences, suspensions, graduation rates, post graduation plans, teachers’ experience). Specific examples of possible evaluation enhancements include (a) better
sampling, (b) better understanding of context, (c) more comprehensive inputs and outcomes, and (d) more compelling presentations that are customizable on the spot. As a result of GIS and ready access to vast amounts of relevant census data via the Internet, these evaluation-enhancing resources are now readily available to many evaluators.

K-12 Evaluation Tools and Methods
MultiPaper Session 412 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Douglas W Huffman, University of Minnesota

Development of a Direct Observation Measure for Assessing Systemic Change in Classroom Management and Discipline Practices
Presenters Ray V Burke, Girls and Boys Town
Michele M Hensley, Girls and Boys Town
Kristin L Duppong-Hurley, Girls and Boys Town
Robert G Oats, Girls and Boys Town

Making Sense of a New School Position: Using Multilevel Modeling in a Large District
Presenter Barbara J Lehman, Los Angeles Unified School District

Strategies for Extracting Data from Low Social Economic Status (SES) Families
Presenters Majka W Mitchell, Baylor Evaluation Services Center
Joseph E Nyre, Baylor University
Sarah E Bailey, Baylor Evaluation Services Center

An Evaluation of the Science Learning Cycle Lesson Plan Rubric: Does It Improve Preservice Teachers Lesson Plans?
Presenters Judy L Giesen, University of Alabama
Cheryl Sundberg, University of Alabama
Don Wright, University of Alabama

Cluster Evaluation Characteristics and Standards in a World of Systemic Change
Panel Session 413 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG
Chair Cynthia C Phillips, phillips wyatt knowlton

Session Abstract This session will clarify characteristics of cluster evaluation important across multiple situations and those important in specific situations. Panelists will look at various types of cluster evaluations in light of existing evaluation standards in Germany and the USA. Many cluster evaluations are designed to support initiatives involved in fundamental system change. Consequently, the session will include an analysis of ways existing standards do and do not recognize dynamic, evolving social systems and limited resources. Teri Behrens will present the W.K.Kellogg Foundation perspective on types of “clusters” determined by different learning purposes for the funding institution. Karin Haubrich (Germany) and Beverly Parsons (USA) will describe characteristics of cluster evaluations they have conducted and the challenges they have faced in meeting evaluation standards. Panelists will offer proposals for how to apply current standards to cluster evaluation.

Emerging Types of Cluster Evaluations
Presenter Teresa R Behrens, WK Kellogg Foundation

Abstract As more and more cluster evaluations are done, it is becoming clearer that there are a range of types of initiatives to which cluster evaluation is appropriate and that the nature of the cluster evaluation differs among these types of initiatives. For example, initiatives vary in their scope (national, regional, local) and in their purpose. Teri Behrens (W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Director) will illuminate the different types of clusters and the nature of the cluster evaluation appropriate for each.

Cluster Evaluation of Pilot Programs in Germany: Characteristics and Challenges
Presenter Karin Haubrich, Deutsches J ugendiinstut

Abstract Cluster evaluation was introduced into the German debate on evaluation in 1997 through the transfer of this approach to the evaluation of federal pilot programs in the field of child and youth services. This transfer required the adaptation of cluster evaluation to another type of program in another country with special social, political and structural conditions. Karin Haubrich will (1) describe characteristics of cluster evaluations of pilot
Cluster Evaluation and Its Application to Systemic Change Initiatives

Presenter: Beverly A. Parsons, InSites

Abstract: Cluster evaluation is increasingly being used to evaluate initiatives designed to support major systemic change in education and social services. Beverly Parsons will discuss features of four cluster evaluations she has been involved in conducting within the USA. One of the evaluations also involves central and eastern European countries. She will look at features the evaluations have in common and ways they vary depending on the purpose of the evaluation and other conditions. She will look at how an initiative’s focus on systemic change affects the way evaluation standards are applied.

Leveraging Change in Engineering Education Through Evaluation: Examples from the Field

Panel Session 414 to be held in the Prince William room

Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG

Chair: Michael S. Trevisan, Washington State University
Discussant: Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico

Session Abstract: In recent years engineering education has seen increased pressure to enhance the training of engineering students. Two evaluation features impacting this reform effort is revised accreditation requirements focusing on outcomes and assessment, and the infusion of National Science Foundation funded engineering education projects, all of which include a rigorous evaluation component. This panel will present examples from a variety of engineering education projects, discussing the impact evaluation is having on these efforts. The national initiative to enhance engineering education and the evaluation to support this effort, also presents unique challenges for evaluators working to assist engineering educators and will be discussed in this panel. The intent of the panel is to increase awareness among evaluators regarding the evaluation demands facing engineering education, and discuss ways to enhance the evaluation capacity of engineering education programs.

Elevated Standards for Engineering Program Accreditation: Current Status, Challenges and Opportunities

Presenter: Steven W. Beyerlein, University of Idaho

Abstract: Over the course of the last five years, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) has begun implementing new criteria for program accreditation. These changes have inspired a movement away from periodic documentation of instructor intentions and teaching effort in curriculum classes toward ongoing measurement and demonstration of continual improvement of integrated learning outcomes demonstrated by students at the end of the program. This paper retracts the evolution of Engineering Criteria 2000 and explores its broad impact on program planning, data collection and analysis expected in self-study reports, and the role/training of external evaluators. Conclusions are supported by numerous ABET publications, anecdotes acquired through a national survey of senior capstone design instructors, and perceptions conveyed in interviews with departmental ABET coordinators. Challenges to quality implementation of outcomes-based accreditation in a higher education setting are identified as are relevant lessons from K-12 program evaluation experience. Areas of possible collaboration between Colleges of Engineering and Colleges of Education in addressing these challenges are highlighted and elaborated.

Impacts of Formative Assessment in Engineering Design Education

Presenter: Denny C. Davis, Washington State University

Abstract: The “Transferable Integrated Design Engineering Education” or TIDEE project has been a catalyst for change in engineering education. Its 2- and 4-year partner institutions have engaged in joint efforts to improve engineering design curriculum, instruction, and assessment across the Pacific Northwest and beyond. TIDEE’s development and pilot testing of a Design Team Readiness Assessment has provided instructors in numerous engineering disciplines a tool for assessing student knowledge and performance skills in the engineering design process, teamwork, and design communication. Instructor implementation of this assessment has produced both expected and unexpected benefits to them and their students. Overall, this assessment has increased collaboration among institutions and disciplines, guided revisions to classroom instruction, improved student learning, and stimulated new collaborative initiatives. This paper will present background on the Design Team Readiness Assessment, discuss issues related to its administration, and identify changes facilitated by the assessment.

Evaluation in Support of National Science Foundation (NSF) Sponsored Integrative Graduate Education and Research Training (IGERT): A PI’s Perspective

Presenter: James Peterson, Washington State University

Abstract: In the NSF sponsored Integrative Graduate Education and Research Training (IGERT) program, more than 35 students are being...
prepared in an interdisciplinary fashion to be the environmental engineers and scientists of the future. Research programs are designed to enable the students to learn about multidisciplinary research on the physical, chemical and biological processes that mediate chemical species transport in the environment and the development of tools to predict regional scale transport of these chemicals. Through review of materials and interactions with the students, the program evaluation is completed to provide internal guidance on ways to improve the various program components. These components include specific classes, mentoring opportunities, laboratory rotations and internships.

**Issues in the Evaluation of Engineering Programs and Projects**

**Presenters**
- Michael S Trevisan, Washington State University
- Larry J McKenzie, Washington State University

**Abstract**
Engineering education continues sustained reform of its programs and services. These efforts are being supported by evaluation in two ways. First, revised accreditation expectations require a focus on outcomes and measurement of results. Second, National Science Foundation funding designed to enhance engineering education consistently requires rigorous evaluation. This presentation will discuss a variety of challenges and issues evaluators must contend with when providing evaluation service to engineering education programs. In particular, this presentation will focus on (a) the shift in thinking required by faculty to respond to accreditation requirements that focus on outcomes rather than inputs, (b) the critical need for evaluation training among engineering educators, and (c) the development of evaluation capacity within engineering programs and projects. Lessons learned working with a variety of National Science Foundation funded projects and programs facing accreditation will be discussed.
TIG Sponsored Sessions

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Evaluation Activities of the Justice Research and Statistics Association and State Statistical Analysis Centers

Business Meeting Session 416 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG

TIG Leaders: Winifred L Reed, US Department of Justice
Ronald Everett, National Institute of Justice
Deborah Levy, Justice Research and Statistics Association

Presenter: Stan Orchowsky, Justice Research and Statistics Association

Abstract: The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is a national nonprofit organization whose primary members are state Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs). SACs are state government entities that are responsible for conducting research, evaluation, and statistical studies of justice issues in their states. JRSA and the SACs have a number of evaluation-related projects and activities. This presentation will present an overview of evaluation activities at JRSA and in the state SACs. JRSA currently has two primary projects designed to enhance evaluation capacity in the states: the Bureau of Justice Assistance Evaluation Web site, and the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center Online Web site. The presentation will focus on current activities of these two projects, and will also include information on recent evaluation activities in the states.

International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 417 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders: Mary B Church, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning
Lucia Fort, The World Bank
Kate Spring, Independent Consultant

TIG Business Meeting and Think Tank: Ramifications of ESEA Reauthorization for States and School Districts

Business Meeting Session 418 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders: Maria D Whitsett, Austin Independent School District
Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant
Anne M Chamberlain, Success For All Foundation

Facilitator: Maria D Whitsett, Austin Independent School District

Abstract: Participants will be given packets of existing literature assessing the impact of ESEA reauthorization upon states and school districts, particularly with regard to evaluation requirements for the federal programs. Then they will be asked to describe urgent needs and required changes for their state and local systems to be in compliance with the new evaluation mandates. As discussion progresses, common needs and organizational changes to support evaluation requirements will be identified. Participants will then brainstorm ways that these needs can be met, including development of a support network among TIG members. In so doing, participants can return to their locales with the possibility of being able to rapidly locate and supply appropriate solutions to the practical evaluation problems faced by their organizations, as districts and states strive to come into compliance with new mandates. The meeting will conclude with the completion of routine TIG business (elections for new leadership, etc.).

Qualitative Methods TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 419 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG

TIG Leader: Leslie Goodyear, City Year
TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: The Natural Histories of Effective Interventions

Business Meeting Session 420 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
TIG Leaders
Gary Cox, University of Washington
Patrick McKnight, University of Arizona
George Julnes, Utah State University
Frederick L Newman, Florida International University
Presenter
Lee B Sechrest, University of Arizona

Abstract
Researchers take it for granted that effective interventions should be evidence-based and they define evidence in terms of a fairly narrow range of experimental designs. Yet, even a cursory examination of what are widely accepted as effective means of resolving human problems will show that very few of them have been subjected to any sort of formal testing. Consideration of how these interventions have come to be accepted as effective may shed some helpful light on how the effectiveness of newly proffered interventions should be explored and how effective science may be as an intervention to facilitate that process.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Issues TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 421 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues TIG
TIG Leaders
Denice A Cassaro, Cornell University
Saumitra Sengupta, City & County of San Francisco
Xan Young, Education Development Center

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Moving Non-profits to Measurement - A United Way of America (UWA) Update

Business Meeting Session 422 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
TIG Leaders
Cheryl Endres, Grand Rapids Community College
R Sam Larson, Applied Research
Presenter
Margaret Plantz, United Way of America

Abstract
This TIG business meeting begins with a presentation by Meg Plantz, Vice President of Outcome Measurement and Community Investment for United Way of America. Ms. Plantz will recount current efforts and future direction for working with UWA affiliates. She will also address how the UWA efforts connect with other national efforts to measure results in the nonprofit sector. Following this update, members of the Non-profit and Foundations TIG will discuss the impacts of UWA efforts. We will then move to a broader discussion of how the evaluation field can assist foundations and nonprofits in gathering data that demonstrates results and community impact, as well as how to better utilize evaluation findings for program improvement and replication.

State and Local Government TIG Business Meeting and Presentations

Business Meeting Session 423 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
TIG Leaders
Rakesh Mohan, Washington State Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee
Mark Ward, US General Accounting Office
Jules M Marquart, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Planning to Perform: Evaluation Models for City Planners

Presenter
Leora S Waldner, University of California at Berkeley

Abstract
Evaluation has become standard in many fields. However, city planning is a notable exception. Evaluation models are rare and practical examples virtually nonexistent. Be it a comprehensive land use plan or an open space plan, planners often do not have a sense of how well their plans work,
or why. Indeed, the city planning evaluation literature is anemic at best, and the few studies that do exist decry the lack of evaluation tools and examples. By conducting a thorough literature review, this presentation will reveal factors that may make planners less prone to conducting evaluations. These insights may help adapt evaluation tools and theories to city planning. This presentation will also analyze planning textbooks and three common planning products to identify evaluation tools used or proposed by planners, including methods involving trends, indicators, report-writing, and subsequent planning. The presentation concludes by exploring new directions and tools for city planning evaluation.

**Performance Accountability, Quality Management Systems and Evaluation: The Meaningful Relationship?**

**Presenters**
Stephen J Franchak, Independent Consultant
Ajay T Nair, University of Virginia

**Abstract**
Performance accountability and the need for continual improvement are common terms that state and local educational systems are addressing based on state and federal mandates. This has translated into the need for educational entities to strive for national and world class performance. The session will describe a quality management system initiative that is designed to use ISO 9001:2000 standards and the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) criteria. Three years ago, nine Pennsylvania local education agencies begin the process of using the ISO 9001 registration and the Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence as a model for continual improvement. The first step they addressed was working toward the third party registration to the International Quality Standard, ISO 9001. This presentation will address: 1) how schools and state educational agencies are addressing the accountability requirements; 2) rationale for this sequence of activities; comparison of ISO 9001 and the MBNQA; 3) the registration process - preparation to audit, application of the ISO requirements to schools; 4) progress to date and lessons learned.

**TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Future-gazing: American Evaluation Association and Opportunities for Graduate Students and New Evaluators**

**Business Meeting Session 424 to be held in the Tidewater room**

**Sponsored by the Graduate Student TIG**

**TIG Leaders**
Deborah Wasserman, The Ohio State University
Lynette Harper, University of British Columbia
Stephen M Morabito, National Center for Disability Services

**Discussants**
Linda Mabry, Washington State University Vancouver
James Sanders, Western Michigan University

**Abstract**
This activity will take place during the Graduate Student TIG Business Meeting. Two members of the AEA Board will join graduate students and new evaluators to discuss: What's in the future for the AEA? What are the benefits of participating in this TIG, for now and in the future?

**TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Implicit Program Theory: Translating Lived Program Experiences of Women to Policy Makers**

**Business Meeting Session 425 to be held in the Kennedy room**

**Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG**

**TIG Leaders**
Denise Seigart, Mansfield University
Kathryn Bowen, BECS Inc
Tristi C Nichols, Manitou Inc

**Presenter**
Patricia J Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

**Abstract**
Patricia Rogers will discuss how gender, race, social status, and culture impact the development of program theory, particularly how these issues influence ways of knowing and articulating tacit/implicit theories about how a program is received/perceived by program participants. Various barriers (pitfalls) that might arise when there is disparity between policy makers and participants will also be discussed. This discussion will center on a recent project completed by Dr. Rogers involving new mothers enrolled in a program where evaluators sought to understand their implicit program theory and represent these findings to policy makers. Opportunities for others in the audience to share their experiences and strategies will be provided at the close of the presentation.
Extension Education Evaluation TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 427 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG
TIG Leaders
Ellen Taylor-Powell, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Mary S Marczak, University of Minnesota

Program Theory & Theory-driven Evaluation TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 428 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG
TIG Leaders
Katrina L Bledsoe, The College of New Jersey
E Lea Witta, University of Central Florida

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Evaluating Systems Change that Relies on Information Technology

Business Meeting Session 429 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG
TIG Leader
Mark Hawkes, Dakota State University
Session Chair
Anna F Lobosco, New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council
Session Abstract
This panel presentation will focus on the challenges of evaluating systems changes that come from use of information technology in the learning process. The panel will describe programs for learners at the compulsory education (elementary and secondary), post-secondary, and workforce development levels. Concomitantly, the systems outcomes of sustainability, connectivity, transferability, and usability will be explored within the context of evaluating systemic change. In each instance, a short synopsis of the evaluation design and findings will be provided along with critical evaluation issues.
Complexity and Sustainability in Implementing Change That Relies on Information Technology
Presenter
Lyn M Shulha, Queen's University
Abstract
This presentation will focus on the complexity of implementation of information technology and sustainability of resultant change using data from both elementary and secondary schools; special attention will be placed on the importance of developing and assessing sustainability within the evaluation design and the operationalization of sustainability as a factor.
Integrating Technology into the Teaching and Learning Process
Presenter
Dean T Spaulding, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract
This presentation will focus on the real integration of technology in the teaching and learning process. Data from a K-12 evaluation of a Title III state grant program for 60 schools will be used to illustrate this integration; special attention will be placed on connectivity of technology to the teaching-learning process.
Transferability of Information Technology in Post-secondary Settings
Presenter
Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract
This presentation will focus on the development, refinement and institutionalization of information technology using data and experiences from a post-secondary education program that relies on sophisticated computer-based educational modules; special attention will be placed on transferability of technology to other settings.
Usability of Information Technology in Workforce Development
Presenter
Anna F Lobosco, New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council
Abstract
This presentation will focus on the lessons learned in development and piloting the initial modules of a distance learning institute for workforce development in the human services; special attention will be placed on usability of the system for the target audience, comparability of learner outcomes, and cost efficiency of the learning alternative.
TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Evaluation of Social Funds

Business Meeting Session 430 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders
Cynthia C Phillips, phillips wyatt knowlton
Martha Ann Carey, National Institute of Mental Health
Mark Jenness, Western Michigan University
Paule Steichen Asch, IBIS International

Presenter
Soniya Carvalho, The World Bank

Abstract
Social fund projects channel resources to small-scale subprojects proposed, designed, and implemented by public or private agencies, such as local governments, NGOs, and community groups. The subprojects must meet pre-determined eligibility criteria. Typical subprojects include the construction and/or rehabilitation of schools and clinics, water supply and sanitation systems, roads, nutrition interventions, and microcredit programs.

Following their inception in 1987, the World Bank supported about 60 social fund projects with commitments of over US$1.5 billion the end of fiscal 1999. Between 1999 and 2003, the Bank is expected to commit another $1.5 billion to these programs. This evaluation focuses on the extent to which social fund projects are likely to result in sustainable benefits on-the-ground and in enhanced local (government and community) capacity. It is structured as a "theory-based evaluation" and uses a mixed-method approach that combines quantitative and qualitative analyses at the national and community levels in four countries.

Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 431 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG

TIG Leader
Kathy Zantal-Wiener, Independent Consultant

Needs Assessment TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 432 to be held in the Board room
Sponsored by the Needs Assessment TIG

TIG Leader
Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University
**Poster Session and Evening Reception**

**Poster Session 433** to be held in the Regency Ballroom

**Generously sponsored by Sage Publications**

**Hosts**
- Stacey Hueftle Stockdill, EnSearch
- Vanessa McKendall, FacelValu Consulting

**Poster 1: Gauging Product Effectiveness Through Evaluation: Examining the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment's Treatment Improvement Protocols Evaluation Project and Application of Results**

**Presenters**
- Susan W Hayashi, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Susan E Hubbard, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Lynne McArthur, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Becky Melzer, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Marcia Suzuki, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Roshan Hussain, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Anita Cobb, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Judy Huang, Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc
- Kevin P Mulvey, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment

**Abstract**
Evaluation is a process that can potentially be used to improve products, as well as gauge their effectiveness. Understanding this potential, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment is funding a multi-study evaluation of Treatment Improvement Protocols (TIPs) based on the diffusion of innovation theoretical framework (Rogers, 1995). TIPs are consensus-based best practice guidelines which provide salient and effective approaches to substance abuse treatment. The TIPs Evaluation Project consists of three major studies (e.g., the Retrospective Study, the Addiction Treatment Transfer Center Study, and the Prospective Study) and several special studies. This presentation will focus on how results from these studies were used to improve the TIPs’ development and dissemination program in order to make TIPs more useful for substance abuse treatment professionals. More importantly, however, this presentation will highlight how evaluation was used to change the system in which TIPs are developed and disseminated.

**Poster 2: Programme Logic: A Step Further**

**Presenters**
- Kajsa Nilsson, Swedish National Financial Management Authority
- Rolf Sandahl, Swedish National Financial Management Authority

**Abstract**
We have developed an application of the method Programme Logic that describes either an individual programme or the operational structure of an entire policy area in the Swedish central government sector. This is going somewhat further than the traditional application of Programme Logic. One of several aims is to clarify how several different programmes work towards the same objectives. The description of the whole structure will facilitate discussions of priorities and make it easier to evaluate policies and assess the value of the resources invested. It is relatively unusual that the discussions and assumptions that precede different decisions are documented. This contributes to making assessments of results difficult. Why do we seek to achieve a certain outcome? What is the justification for a public commitment? These are examples of questions the application can help us answer. Examples of our application of the method will be presented.

**Poster 3: Modified Matrix Sampling Model as an Alternative Evaluation Tool in Large Scale Assessment**

**Presenters**
- Xin Liang, University of North Dakota
- Richard G Landry, University of North Dakota

**Abstract**

**Poster 4: The Evaluation of the South Carolina/Spain Visiting Teacher Program**

**Presenters**
- Pamela B Finney, SERVE
- Jess Torres, South Carolina Department of Education

**Abstract**
In 1999, the SCDE and the Ministry of Education and Culture of Spain collaboratively established the South Carolina/Spain Visiting Teacher Program. Primary objectives of the program were to: 1) Meet the greater demand for Spanish teachers throughout the state of South Carolina. 2) Provide qualified native speakers at all grade levels 3) Provide students with a linguistically and culturally rich education in order to better prepare them for future success in their personal, academic and professional lives. 4) Actively participate in cross-cultural activities that will provide a greater knowledge
and appreciation of the Spanish culture in schools and communities. Spanish teachers came to the United States in the summer of 2000, and SERVE, the Regional Education Laboratory serving the southeast, provided technical assistance to the SC State Department of Education in designing and implementing the evaluation. Key to the evaluation were "Teacher Portfolios" in which teachers documented their year teaching in the US.

**Poster 5: Web-based Evaluation Systems at Xerox: Current and Future State**

**Presenters**
- Tony Tessier, Xerox Corporation
- Vanessa Moss-Summers, Xerox Corporation
- Linda Tillman, Xerox Corporation
- Laura Grant, Xerox Corporation

**Abstract**
This poster session will present an overview and demonstration of a web-based effectiveness evaluation system used at Xerox Corporation. The purposes of the web-based system are to: 1) provide a practical and efficient method to evaluate hundreds of e-learning and instructor-led events offered by the corporation 2) support education and learning design/development professionals in creating and posting standardized evaluation instruments so learners may complete and submit evaluative feedback about their learning experience, and 3) enable authorized users to request reports on the results of these effectiveness evaluations. The system is designed such that reports can be provided in either text or graphic format; or as raw data files for further analyses. The reports are delivered as attachments to an email sent by the requester. The benefit of the system is to furnish on-demand formative and summative feedback on learning events, while freeing up time to more thoroughly evaluate other key initiatives.

**Poster 6: Widening the Turf of Evaluation Reporting with Mixed-representational Evaluation Reports**

**Presenter**
Mei Chin Chin, Florida State University

**Abstract**
This presentation concerns a mixed-representational evaluation report produced for a real program evaluation setting in the United States of America. In this report, I used poems and cartoons to complement conventional representational forms such as graphs, tables, and quotes in communicating evaluation findings. The purpose of producing a mixed-representational evaluation report is to explore the possibilities of communicating various kinds of evaluation findings in accessible venues for diverse audiences. Poetry transcends the limits of language and evokes what cannot be articulated. History has shown that cartoons could stir consciences and portray a comedy of manners, titillating and amusing the populace. This shows cartoons are understood even to those who may not be especially literate. Would these apply to evaluation reporting? Would a mixed-representational report be well received by evaluation practitioners? It would be pertinent and interesting if fellow evaluators at the AEA discuss and critique this mixed-representational evaluation report.

**Poster 7: Application of Holistic Process of Inquiry in Program Evaluation**

**Presenter**
Abbas Darabi, Florida State University

**Abstract**
Borrowing from the fields of performance technology and management design, this paper applies the concepts of "business drivers" and "holistic process of inquiry" to program evaluation. Given the role of evaluation questions in driving the evaluation plan and activities, the paper suggests the "holistic process of inquiry" as a means of analysis and assessment based on which the evaluation questions and criteria are formulated. It highlights the prominent role of the evaluation questions by identifying the functions, structures, processes, and environments as the areas from which the questions are derived. It also introduces an alternative for logic model in conducting program analysis.

**Poster 8: An Evaluation of the Summer Technology and Engineering Preview Camp's (STEPS) Effectiveness at the University of Wisconsin-Stout**

**Presenter**
Rebecca J Farnham, Presbyterian Church

**Abstract**
The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of STEPS participation on short-term outcome attainment. Specifically, this study examined and compared the 1997 STEPS campers and the remaining cohorts from 1997 that did not attend. A thorough examination of variables was conducted to complete a comprehensive assessment of STEPS effectiveness on short-term outcome attainment. To gather information a survey was developed and administered to 48 young women; 29 alumni and 19 controls. Each of these young women were a participant of the 1997 Summer Technology and Engineering Preview Camp (STEPS) (alumni) or an applicant to the camp (control). The average age for this study's participants is 15.37, with the mean age of 15.27 years old for the alumni's and 15.47 years old for the controls. Constructs encompassed within this study include academic and extracurricular activity involvement, career interests and role expectations. All constructs examined are reflective of the barriers that exist for women today and engineering careers. Two findings within this study were found to be consistent with STEPS goals. A correlational relationship was found significant between accelerated science course enrollment and a career interest in engineering for the control group but not the alumni group. This finding suggests that ex-campers do not need to be enrolled in accelerated courses to be interested in engineering, but that controls do. An additional finding supportive of STEPS was identified within the MANOVA, suggesting that the alumni enroll in more science, math and technology courses than do the control group. Both findings demonstrate that STEPS alleviates barriers, therefore increasing the exposure of these young women to the field of engineering.

**Poster 9: The Role of Adult Learning Principles in Professional Development Evaluation**
This presentation includes operationalized adult learning principles that can be observed and measured, methods for gathering information, a pilot observer programs. Attempts to utilize these principles as quality indicators have not yet been employed and there is little information on how they should be applied. The degree to which adult learning principles are applied may serve as a more comprehensive guideline in the design, implementation, and evaluation of quality conducive to learning. Such principles recognize the adult as a learner capable of self-direction with a need to contribute, relate to prior experiences, and make learning relevant. However, the effectiveness of many programs is being determined solely through participant satisfaction surveys. Assessing the degree to which adult learning principles are applied may serve as a more comprehensive guideline in the design, implementation, and evaluation of quality programs. Attempts to utilize these principles as quality indicators have not yet been employed and there is little information on how they should be applied. This presentation includes operationalized adult learning principles that can be observed and measured, methods for gathering information, a pilot observer rating scale, and an overview of the evaluative usefulness of these measures in serving planning, formative, and summative purposes.

**Poster 10: The Employment Consortia Project: Documenting Systems Change**

*Presenters: Christine M Muller, Developmental Disabilities Planning Council  
Anna F Lobosco, New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council*

*Abstract: Proposal: A fifteen minute presentation and round table discussion will be dedicated to discussing the documentation of systems change through the three IÆs model. This model is best described as a "dynamic, cyclical model that provides evaluators and implementers with the means to revisit given phases (of system change) and consider their relationships with other phases, thus leading to a systematic assessment of change." Systems change will be discussed in the context of a project funded by the New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council. This project, called the "Employment Consortia Project" was initiated with the intent of providing increased job opportunities to individuals with developmental disabilities (DD). The focus of the round table discussion will center on the documentation of efforts to increase these opportunities and how documentation using the Three IÆs model can facilitate systems change in the employment of individuals with DD. Newman, D.L. (2001, November). Evaluating systems change: A model of assessment. Presented at Evaluation 2001: the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association in St. Louis, MO, November 7-10, 2001.*


**Poster 11: Benefits to Teen Mentors Involved in Programming for School-aged Youth**

*Presenter: Michael E Newman, Mississippi State University*

*Abstract: This evaluation focused on the changes in leadership skills and self-esteem of teen mentors involved in an Extension tobacco prevention program. Teen mentors leadership skills and self-esteem were measured before and after the mentoring activity. The leadership skills instrument was developed as part of the revised version of the self-report Personal Skill Assessment Guide in the 4-H Curriculum, Leadership Skills You Never Outgrow, Book III and revised by Laurie Blackwell for a masters thesis at New Mexico State University in 1990. The mentors' self-esteem was measured using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1979). This Guttman scale inventory provides a global measure of self-esteem and has been shown to be valid and reliable. It is a short instrument that has been shown to be an adequate replacement for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.*

**Poster 12: District Mathematics Plan Evaluation: A Theory-driven Approach**

*Presenter: Xiaohua Ai, Los Angeles Unified School District*

*Abstract: Recent years have seen vigorous and sustained efforts to improve the quality of student achievement. Mathematics has featured prominently in these efforts, despite which, the apparent limited competence of American students in mathematics continues to be a major concern. Poor performance in mathematics has prompted a large urban school district to adopt a district-wide mathematics plan to improve students' mathematical competencies and give all students access to algebra. The 5-year plan aims to achieve this goal through alignment of math curriculum with the State standards and provision of on-going professional development. The proposed study attempts to report our effort in developing a theory-driven approach to evaluate this longitudinal math plan. Research on instructional policy and classroom teaching and learning has shown that effective operation of any instructional policy depends in considerable part on professionals' learning. Teachers have to learn new views of mathematics and new approaches to math teaching in order to fully implement the District Mathematics Plan (DMP). Teachers' opportunities to learn (OTL) will influence teachers' ability to adopt new beliefs and practices. In our evaluation model, students' mathematics performance is the ultimate dependent measure of DMP, and teaching practice is both an intermediate dependent measure of DMP and an independent factor that exerts direct influence on students' performance. Teachers' opportunities to learn what DMP implies for instruction through on-going professional development, to a great extent, influence directly their instructional practices, and thus affect students' performance.*


*Presenters: Julie A Thompson-Keane, Education Development Center Inc  
Tisha Pryor, Center for Children and Technology  
Deborah Kelsch, Center for Children and Technology*

*Abstract: Recent years have seen vigorous and sustained efforts to improve the quality of student achievement. Mathematics has featured..."
prominently in these efforts, despite which, the apparent limited competence of American students in mathematics continues to be a major concern. Poor performance in mathematics has prompted a large urban school district to adopt a district-wide mathematics plan to improve students' mathematical competencies and give all students access to algebra. The 5-year plan aims to achieve this goal through alignment of math curriculum with the State standards and provision of on-going professional development. The proposed study attempts to report our effort in developing a theory-driven approach to evaluate this longitudinal math plan. Research on instructional policy and classroom teaching and learning has shown that effective operation of any instructional policy depends in considerable part on professionals' learning. Teachers have to learn new views of mathematics and new approaches to math teaching in order to fully implement the District Mathematics Plan (DMP). Teachers' opportunities to learn (OTL) will influence teachers' ability to adopt new beliefs and practices. In our evaluation model, students' mathematics performance is the ultimate dependent measure of DMP, and teaching practice is both an intermediate dependent measure of DMP and an independent factor that exerts direct influence on students' performance. Teachers' opportunities to learn what DMP implies for instruction through on-going professional development, to a great extent, influence directly their instructional practices, and thus affect students' performance.

Poster 14: A Comparison of Outcome Data from Self-reports and Official Records
Presenters: Kelli J. Klebe, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
          Evie Fisher, Colorado Department of Corrections
          Maureen L. O'Keefe, Colorado Department of Corrections

Abstract: In an outcome evaluation of multiple intensive residential treatment programs for substance use with criminal justice clients, both self-report interviews data and official record data were collected on the same participants. Interview data was collected at two time periods in 2 hour interviews with the participant. Data collected in interviews include a wide variety of information but for this paper there is a focus on employment data, substance use, and criminal activities. Official records include arrest data, re-incarceration data, and employment data. In this study, we compare the responses for nearly 250 participants on these two sources of data. Agreement between the two data sources is explored. Differences in costs of data collection and quality of data are discussed.

Poster 15: Using System-specific Models and Templates with Decision-makers and Stakeholders
Presenters: Carla W. Hess, HB Associates
          Richard G. Landry, University of North Dakota
          Annalisa Batson, HB Associates

Abstract: This practice-oriented session will describe how evaluations of large, multi-component systems were visually depicted to promote decision-makers' and stakeholders' understandings of their own systems and the evaluation of those systems. Three case studies will represent different uses of models and templates. In each case a team of external evaluators developed a system-specific model or set of templates to guide evaluation processes. The cases included 1) a three-state migrant Hispanic farmworkers' diabetes education program; 2) a 15-program Drug-Free Schools initiative; and 3) a district-wide, K-12 multi-program internal evaluation project. The models and templates will be displayed in this session. The processes used to develop these designs will be outlined. Samples of formative and summative metaevaluation of the models and templates will be provided. This presentation supports the conference theme by dealing with evaluation of systems and illustrating the role that evaluation can play in "reforming" decision-makers' and stakeholders' understandings and practices.

Poster 16: The Role of Evaluation in the Warner School PT3 Program
Presenters: Elizabeth M. Bentley, University of Rochester
          Peter Abas, University of Rochester
          Michael Wischnowski, University of Rochester

Abstract: This poster session presents findings from a formative evaluation of the University of Rochester Warner School of Education's PT3 (Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to use Technology) program. Participants will gain an overview of the progress of the program and the critical role of evaluation in guiding program development. During its first year the program has focused on assessing the needs of the teacher education faculty with regard to technology use and integration, offering a range of technology-related professional development opportunities, and developing the capacity and facilities to support technology use in the Warner School. Courses required for teacher certification have been redesigned to incorporate technology so future teachers are able to effectively use technology to support student learning and achievement. Evaluation has emphasized tracking the input and process variables which impact the effective functioning of the program components, as well as documenting some preliminary outcomes. Warner's PT3 program and evaluation are inextricably linked, with evaluation conclusions serving to continuously help shape the scope and direction of project activities. In this way, evaluation is indeed a systemic process that is helping reform the system of teacher education.

Poster 17: Web-based Leadership Training: A Final Look
Presenter: Darlene Russ-Eft, Oregon State University
Abstract: This evaluation examined the effectiveness of leadership training via asynchronous and synchronous classroom web-based training as compared with leadership training via a traditional classroom approach. (The web-based training used Centra to provide trainees with an opportunity to talk with peers, share their ideas aloud or via a whiteboard, and to practice interpersonal skills with a peer in break-out sessions.) Using a longitudinal case-study method (by collecting data after sessions throughout the year-long period), comparisons are made with data collected earlier in the training program (Russ-Eft, Hurson, Pangilinan, & Egherman, 2002; Russ-Eft & Pangilinan, 2002). Major questions were: 1) What are the outcomes of asynchronous and synchronous Web-based training as compared with traditional classroom training? 2) What factors affect the success of asynchronous and synchronous Web-based training? 3) In what ways were these success factors and outcomes similar to those found at earlier stages in the training?

**Poster 18: Investing In the Evaluation Capacity of the Local Nonprofit Community: A Collaborative Approach**

**Presenters:** Kristina M. Moster, The Greater Cincinnati Foundation  
Joan Ferrante, Northern Kentucky University

**Abstract:** In 2000, Greater Cincinnati-area funders developed a Common Grant Application with the goal of improving the quality of proposals while reducing the burden on grantseekers. Feedback obtained from both funders and grantseekers one year later was favorable, and funders reported the quality of proposals had improved. However, funders noted that most applicants could not adequately answer questions regarding evaluation. Funders are spending time coaching applicants individually in developing this skill. This approach is inefficient and reaches too few organizations, leading to little systemic impact. To address this, the group designed an Evaluation Training/Coaching Program in collaboration with a local university and nonprofit consulting group. The program will offer training and personalized mentoring for 100 nonprofit agencies in 2002. Projected outcomes include an increase in participants' knowledge, skills, and self-confidence regarding evaluation, increased use of evaluation in participants' program planning, and improvement in the quality of evaluation information submitted to funders.

**Poster 19: Baseline Evaluation of Health Services: Head Start Parent and Child Need and Use**

**Presenters:** Leanne Whiteside-Mansell, University of Arkansas for Medical Science  
Nicola Connors, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences  
Amy Lewin, Children's National Medical Center  
Belinda E Sims, John Hopkins University  
Eileen O'Brien, US Department of Health and Human Services

**Abstract:** This study examined the prevalence of developmental and behavioral health service need and use for Head Start eligible children and parents in three geographically diverse study sites in the U.S. participating in the Starting Early, Starting Smart Project. Across sites, this study found rates substantially higher than reported in the general population and that about twice as many parents and children needed services as received them; however, differences in the rates of need and service use were seen across sites. Parenting stress and the parent's psychological status were key factors in children need and use of services. Children's need for services (based on social behavior), parenting stress, and the level of marital violence were key factors in parent need and service use. However, for both parents and children, differences across study sites suggested unique characteristics related to service need.

**Poster 20: The Need for Program Evaluators to Work with Funding Agencies**

**Presenter:** Ralph Renger, University of Arizona

**Abstract:** Of central concern to many agencies focused on improving health is the need to demonstrate the impact of the initiatives they fund. Unfortunately, problems with the manner in which RFPs are created prevent agencies from being able to do so, central to which is lack of clarity about the antecedent conditions of the health problem being addressed. As a consequence applicants each develop unique evaluation plans, reducing the likelihood that information across studies can be combined in a meaningful way to arrive at an overall conclusion of the impact of the initiative. This is unfortunate because in many cases the impetus for the RFP is strong empirical evidence suggesting that changes in certain antecedent conditions will likely lead to a change in the health problem, but this isn't well articulated in the RFP. This paper demonstrates how an evaluator working with a funding agency can develop a more streamlined RFP that will a) result in cost savings in review time, b) allow impact and outcome data to be meaningfully combined, and c) shifts the focus of the applicant from regurgitating known theory to creatively addressing how they propose to affect the antecedent conditions of a health problem via proposed programs.

**Poster 21: Changing Evaluation Methods to Enhance Utilization of Findings for a State Juvenile Justice Model**

**Presenters:** Dan Kaczynski, University of West Florida  
Julie Kunselman, University of West Florida  
John W Rhodes, Georgia Southwestern State University  
Tom Brame, University of West Florida

**Abstract:** The University of West Florida (UWF), Office of Juvenile Studies (OJS) is in the first year of a multi-year evaluation of an innovative vocational education program. Sponsorship of the evaluation is provided by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). A private provider is
contracted to implement the model program, which is a conditional release, residential vocational education transition program for 32 adolescent males. Youth enrolled in the program receive comprehensive education and training toward vocational certification. OJS has designed an evaluation model which monitors process and outcome measures using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Findings are compiled and presented to DJJ on a regular schedule to facilitate both objectives-oriented program evaluation and management-oriented program evaluation. This presentation will focus on the significant changes in evaluation methods which have occurred throughout the first year. Utilization of findings has drawn particular attention to the evaluation of program implementation.

**Poster 22: Assessing Treatment Implementation in Human Service Agencies: Identifying Training Needs and Improving Outcomes**

**Presenters**
- Kristin L Duppong-Hurley, Girls and Boys Town
- Cathy Nelson, Girls and Boys Town
- Tanya R Shaw, Girls and Boys Town

**Abstract**

While many human service agencies collect outcome data, far fewer collect treatment implementation data due to time and resource constraints. Treatment implementation issues are often addressed through ongoing consultation; however, this format usually consists of general observation notes and is seldom examined in a systematic manner to provide detailed information to both trainers and evaluators. As it is often difficult and time-consuming to collect implementation information, this paper will discuss an approach to assessing treatment implementation that is relatively easy to use and provides a variety of information to various stakeholders. The observation form that was developed included descriptive notes on the observation, ratings on specific components of the model, overall ratings of treatment implementation, and a feedback form for staff. This paper will discuss an approach used to assess treatment implementation, share preliminary data, and describe efforts to increase agency support for assessing treatment implementation.

**Poster 23: Utilizing Various Qualitative Data Sources in a Statewide Evaluation Of Mental Health Services for Children: The Whole is Greater than the Sum of the Parts**

**Presenters**
- Lois Lynn Stoyko Deuel, University of California at San Francisco
- Abram Rosenblatt, University of California at San Francisco

**Abstract**

In conducting evaluations for government agencies, researchers frequently feel limited in their ability to use a full complement of data collection strategies and analytical tools. Clients may want to "study outcomes before understanding implementation or processes" or know "the bottom line" or "what the numbers show" without identifying any real measurable or meaningful outcomes. Clients may be unaware of the range, availability, and quality of potential data sources. Sometimes clients want limited involved in the evaluation work and are unavailable to engage or assist in the evaluation activities. Finally, many clients want "the results" yesterday. This poster highlights a successful and creative approach to a state-contracted evaluation of mental health services for children. Under tight time lines, and using an iterative process, evaluators identified a variety of data sources that were incomplete or problematic in isolation, but when combined, produced a "whole" greater than the sum of the parts.

**Poster 24: Establishing Metaevaluation Criteria for an Evaluation and Consultation Practice**

**Presenters**
- Annalisa Batson, HB Associates
- Carla W Hess, HB Associates
- Michael Wischnowski, University of Rochester

**Abstract**

This poster session will present the outcomes of a series of procedures undertaken by two evaluation and consultation associates in their efforts to create a practical application of Essential Evaluator Competencies and AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators for use in metaevaluation. These activities included: 1) combining the principles and competencies into one list of competencies for practice, 2) rating the competencies on two levels: need for the competency within our practice and our need for improvement to meet the competency, 3) rewording of the competencies into statements of objectives for our practice, and 4) design of a client satisfaction survey instrument to assess our level of achievement of those objectives.

**Poster 25: Evaluation of a Project Designed to Increase the Number of Minority StudentsMajoring in the Natural and Social Sciences**

**Presenters**
- Arlene Edwards, University of District of Columbia
- Catherine Barber, University of District of Columbia
- Victor Butler, University of District of Columbia
- Ali Rahman, University of District of Columbia
- Tonya Seaward, University of District of Columbia

**Abstract**

This presentation evaluates a national conference designed to facilitate the professional growth and development of minority students in the sciences. The 59th Joint Meeting of the National Institute of Science, Beta Kappa Chi Scientific Honor Society, and the Brookhaven Semester Program (BKX/NIS/BSP) is conducted to increase the number of minority students participating in careers in the sciences. The organizations accomplish this goal by providing funds and presentation opportunities for faculty and students attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Four pre and post
Surveys and limited interviewing are used to determine the effects of conference attendance on achieving five objectives set by the National Institute Science and supporting schools. Four students currently attending an HBCU were included in helping to design the instruments, collect and analyze the data and prepare it for submission during their first attendance at a national evaluation conference.

**Poster 26: An Automated Population-based Framework for Integrating Estimates of Substance Abuse Treatment Needs: Implemented For the State of Louisiana**

**Presenters**
- Rachal Valley, RTI International
- Karen Pendergast, RTI International
- Carol Council, RTI International

**Abstract**
State substance abuse treatment service providers, planners, and those who make resource allocation decisions frequently need to integrated treatments needs data from a variety of sources and for diverse populations. Information on current services capacity and costs for various modalities within a service area must also be considered within the context of limited budgets. This session presents an automated planning tool using a population based framework that was developed and implemented for the State of LA and applied to substance abuse treatment needs and services system issues. (The tool has also been applied to five other states.) The integrating framework uses a basic approach that identifies a set of mutually exclusive sub-population groups within a state, a state planning area or a county that in sum constitute the population to be served. The approach is automated using and Excel spreadsheet. Costs and treatment modules are included. The spreadsheet allows substitutions for default data, thus allowing various treatment, costs, population and other scenarios to be examined for a State or other geographic area. In addition to the poster, the model will be demonstrated using a laptop.

**Poster 27: Neighborhood Capacity-building Through Resident Involvement: The Village Houses Program**

**Presenter**
Yolanda G Martinez, Orange County Health Department

**Abstract**
There has been an increasing concern over the social, cultural and economic factors that negatively influence the well being of children and adolescents. Of particular concern are social and environmental factors that influence adolescents to engage in risk behaviors. Studies consistently reveal that successful initiatives to reduce these types of behaviors among teenagers should be multifaceted with strong community involvement. This poster presentation will provide progress evaluation data on a neighborhood-based program called the Village Houses. The Village Houses program is theoretically based on the concept of social/cultural capital. The primary goal of the program is to build neighborhood capacity to (1) increase school success, (2) increase youth involvement in community activities, (3) decrease adolescent pregnancies, and (4) increase parental involvement in youth activities.

**Poster 28: Survey Response Rates Among Minorities: Examining the Effectiveness of Multiple Modes of Contact**

**Presenters**
- Germine H Awad, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
- Chad Briggs, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

**Abstract**
Increasing response rates has always been an issue for those who use mail or Internet surveys. In this study, a social climate survey was mailed to a sample of African American, Asian American and Hispanic American students at a large Midwestern university. A replacement survey and an E-mail reminder were then sent to increase the respective group response rates. Results are discussed with regard the following: (1) initial overall response rates, (2) incremental response rates following the replacement survey, (3) incremental response rates following the E-mail reminder, (4) differential overall response rates between minority groups, and (5) the availability of E-mail addresses among the minority student sample. Implications of the findings are also discussed.

**Poster 29: Conceptualization of a Resilience Framework in a School-based Social Service Agency: Pilot Test of a Resilience-measurement Tool**

**Presenter**
Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant

**Abstract**
Despite chronic stress and daily exposure to risks, some adolescents overcome adversity and remain productive in school, have positive self-schemas, and create a future for themselves. Researchers have labeled these individuals, who overcome life's challenges, as 'resilient,' because they are able to bounce back from stressful situations. One purpose of this project was to explore possible reasons why other empirically-based resilience evaluations have been unable to measure change. This project utilizes best-practices in pilot-testing a measurement tool. Data analysis uses Rasch Measurement Techniques. Preliminary results indicate that there is no opportunity for the traditionally-used resilience scales to empirically measure increased resilience traits, because the items fail to operationalize the internal and external assets possessed by those individuals at the higher end of the resilience continuum. Presenting this project during the AEA 2002 will be an opportunity to gather detailed feedback on preliminary results and suggestions for 'next steps.'

**Poster 30: External Threats to the Evaluation System: Considering the Case of 9/11/01**

**Presenters**
- John P Jasek, New York University
- Beth C Weitzman, New York University

**Abstract**
This presentation will address the impact of 9/11/01 on the National Evaluation of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Urban Health Initiative, an eight-year (1997-2005) project charged with improving the health and well-being of children and youth in five disadvantaged U.S. cities.
The evaluation team, located at New York University, is utilizing a multi-method evaluation approach comprising a telephone survey of adults and youth across the nation, a trends analysis of administrative data, key informant interviews, site visits and a fiscal analysis. Each of these components was affected, or may yet be influenced, by sequelae from 9/11. Our presentation will examine these effects and our responses, with a particular focus on the survey component, since it is the method that was most immediately and directly affected. Attempts to account for the impact of 9/11 through question selection, delaying survey fielding, etc., will be reviewed, along with selected survey data.

**Poster 31: Evolving Design Expectations of Funders During Program Implementation**

**Presenter** Michael E Wolf-Branigin, Caliber Associates

**Abstract** Just as expectations of funding sources change the interventions provided by programs, measures to determine the intervention’s impacts likewise evolve. An example of this phenomenon occurred at the Adolescent Employment Readiness Center (AERC) of the Children's National Medical Center. AERC provides various career development services to adolescents and young adults who have physical disabilities and reside in the District of Columbia. The four-year Opening Doors to the Future for Adolescents with Special Health Care Needs project funded by the Social Security Administration assists these individuals seek and obtain employment, with the likelihood of reducing the desire to remain on Supplemental Security Income. Based on the desires of the finding organization during the initiation of the project, expectations shifted from an evaluation and monitoring approach to one emphasizing experimental research. This presentation will highlight the development of additional tools and creative design approaches to meet the evolving expectations of the funder.

**Poster 32: The Contribution of Internet Technologies within a Multimethod Statewide Evaluation**

**Presenters** Daniel Glass, Glen Martin Associates
                Alan Moore, Glen Martin Associates

**Abstract** This paper discusses the role of web survey data collection techniques within an integrated, multi-method approach to gathering statewide evaluation data and the potential of web-based methods to disseminate program information. The use of multiple and simultaneous online survey instruments to reach targeted populations in New York State introduces several methodological issues when evaluating the results. First, how do we approach the representative or non-representative quality of the initial sample frames as well as the final survey respondents? Second, how can we effectively combine online instruments with traditional paper/pencil surveys within the same target population? And finally, how does the use of email solicitations affect the response rate and representative quality of the sample.

**Poster 33: Alcohol Free Fraternity Housing: Reducing Alcohol-related Problem Behavior or Just Moving the Party?**

**Presenters** Scott B Crosse, Westat
                Barry Caudill, Westat

**Abstract** This paper discusses the role of web survey data collection techniques within an integrated, multi-method approach to gathering statewide evaluation data and the potential of web-based methods to disseminate program information. The use of multiple and simultaneous online survey instruments to reach targeted populations in New York State introduces several methodological issues when evaluating the results. First, how do we approach the representative or non-representative quality of the initial sample frames as well as the final survey respondents? Second, how can we effectively combine online instruments with traditional paper/pencil surveys within the same target population? And finally, how does the use of email solicitations affect the response rate and representative quality of the sample.

**Poster 34: Differences in Drug Use Among 8th and 11th Graders in Urban, Suburban and Rural Communities**

**Presenters** Kathleen M Monahan, Children’s Memorial Medical Center
                Afsaneh Rahimian, Children’s Memorial Institute for Education and Research
                Jenifer Cartland, Children’s Memorial Institute for Education and Research

**Abstract** To examine differences in drug use among students in rural, suburban, and urban school districts, we utilized student survey data collected by the Evaluation of the Safe to Learn Demonstration Project. The sample consists of students in grades 8 (n=877) and 11 (n=605). Self-reported drug use was assessed, within the last 30 days (alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana), and lifetime use of other illegal drugs. More than one-quarter of respondents reported using drugs in the last 30 days, and about 18% reported any lifetime use of drugs. Except for marijuana, drug use in the last 30 days was higher in rural and suburban sites than in urban sites. Lifetime drug use was also significantly higher in rural and suburban vs. urban sites (p<.001). This suggests that early integration of substance abuse prevention is an essential component of any health education curriculum, and should address all drugs in addition to alcohol and tobacco.

**Poster 35: Generational HIV Knowledge Assessment of Youth from 1995 through 2001: Validation of An Assessment Instrument**

**Presenters** Miguel A Chion, AIDS Project Los Angeles
                Jacqueline Villagomez, AIDS Project Los Angeles
Poster 36: The American Evaluation Association Job Bank: An Analysis of Job Listings from the Past Three Years
Presenters: Jennifer M. Camacho, Chicago Department of Public Health
Nicole C. Vicinanza, Aguirre International

Abstract: The content of this poster is based on data from three years' worth of job advertisements posted on AEA's Job Bank. The results presented will include where evaluation jobs are offered the most, what types of agencies are offering jobs, whether evaluation jobs tend to be full-time or consulting positions, what type of degree and experience employers are looking for, and when during the year the most job ads are posted. To the extent possible, this data will be analyzed by year to determine trends, and certain variables, such as salary, will be sorted by job type. We plan to present the data in tables, graphs, and maps.

Poster 37: Collecting and Analyzing Data Via the Internet: A Comparative Study of Three North Carolina School Districts
Presenters: Kathleen Mooney, SERVE

Abstract: This proposal details the methodology used to identify and compare demographic and educational data of three school districts in North Carolina. The data collected for the comparison study were obtained from various government databases available via the Internet, including: census, economic development, state education accountability/testing, and public elementary/secondary school data. Commissioned by a school district interested in assessing the possible affects of systemic demographic and educational issues on their Local Education Agency (LEA) programs, the results of the study will be used by stakeholders to provide data for continuous program improvement.

Poster 38: A Comprehensive Evaluation of Undergraduate Women in Engineering Activities and Resources
Presenter: Irene F. Goodman, Goodman Research Group Inc

Abstract: The Women's Experience in College Engineering (WECE) study was designed as the first national, cross-institutional, longitudinal, controlled evaluation of Women in Engineering programs. The proposed poster will present the key findings from this just-completed NSF- and Sloan Foundation-funded study of 24,000 undergraduate women in engineering from 53 higher education institutions. In addition to the three annual web-based, lengthy student surveys, there were questionnaires for deans, engineering faculty, and WIE directors, and site visits to 11 institutions. The poster will illustrate salient findings from the various informants but will focus on the student data. Using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) and event history (survival) analysis, the study explored those student and institutional factors that were related to participation in support activities and in persistence in engineering, including sources of encouragement and discouragement, growth in self confidence, comfort level, grades, perception of classroom environment, perception of department environment, and quality of teaching.

Poster 39: Utilizing Evaluation Results: Enhancing Local Non-profit Program Improvement with Transformative Learning
Presenter: Melonya K. Cook, United Way of the Greater Dayton Area

Abstract: In 1997 the United Way of the Greater Dayton Area designed and offered free Program Outcome Evaluation Training to funded non-profit programs. Since 1998 local non-profit programs receiving United Way allocations have been required to design and implement a Program Outcome Evaluation System. Over the last four years the capacity of the programs to implement an Outcome Evaluation approach has greatly increased. However, the capacity of the staff to realize and implement program improvements based on the results of their Outcome Evaluations is limited. Outcome-based Evaluation has created a need for increased Transformative Learning for these organizations. The full value of Program Outcome Evaluation cannot be realized by the organization and felt in the community, unless program improvements occur in direct relationship to Outcome results.

Poster 40: Getting to Assumptions: Using the Learning History Interview for Systemic Evaluation
Poster 41: Successes and Challenges in Implementing Integrated Reporting Systems in Los Angeles County

**Presenters**
Nicole Leduc, University of Montreal
Marie-Josee Durand, University of Montreal
Diane Berthelette, Universite du Quebec a Montreal

**Abstract**
All agencies and organizations in the system of HIV prevention are accountable for evidence-based resource allocation and intervention effectiveness. The CDC issued Evaluation Guidance recommends that each jurisdiction develop a data collection mechanism. In response, the Office of AIDS Programs and Policy (OAPP) redesigned their monthly report forms to reflect reporting strategies in the Evaluation Guidance. Additionally, OAPP is developing a new data management system to monitor and evaluate HIV risk reduction activities provided by community partners in Los Angeles County. The HIV Integrated Reporting System will enable OAPP to collect client-level data related to behavior change, access and utilization of services. In response to the Evaluation Guidance a parallel data collection system emerged as the State Office of AIDS introduced their new system, Evaluating Local Interventions. Successes and challenges in integrating multiple reporting systems and creating seamless transitions for all providers will be discussed.

Poster 42: Systematic Review of Occupational Health Program’s Evaluations: Conceptual Framework and Results

**Presenters**
Henriette Bilodeau, Universite du Quebec a Montreal
Diane Berthelette, Universite du Quebec a Montreal
Nicole Leduc, University of Montreal

**Abstract**
Evaluation of occupational health programs is a relatively recent preoccupation in North America and Europe, although these programs are widespread in many branches of industry. Although some evaluation studies have been published, we do not have a clear picture of their effectiveness and of factors inhibiting or enhancing their effects on the prevention of workers’ injuries. This study is the first to systematically review all the evaluations that were published since 1985. Such a review was indicated to find which programs are the most effective and to make wiser choices in resource allocation. We have developed a method based on a normative approach and which includes criteria concerning program description, program theory, evaluation questions and methods. Our results show that most publications consist of normative evaluations. They highlight the scarcity of evaluative researches and put forward the predominance of impact analyses as opposed to other types of evaluative research.

Poster 43: Using Participatory Evaluation for Economic Development Projects in the Mid-South Delta Initiative

**Presenter**
Alan A Gumbel, Gumbel & Associates

**Abstract**
The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has invested heavily building evaluation capacity in its 15 funded communities participating in the Mid-South Delta Initiative. These projects address a variety of approaches of economic development, from alternative crop production, promoting home ownership, micro-enterprise development, work force development, transportation and youth development. Drawing on the Citizen Learning Team model developed by the University of Tennessee Community Partnership Center, each community team has received training and coaching to conduct participatory evaluations of their community projects. This poster explores the experiences of these teams in doing participatory evaluation, the lessons learned by the teams and the findings of their community projects.

Poster 44: Holistic Evaluation of a Primary Prevention Program of Back Injuries Amongst Hospital Health Care Workers

**Presenters**
Diane Berthelette, Universite du Quebec a Montreal
Marie-Josee Durand, University of Montreal
Nicole Leduc, University of Montreal
Henriette Bilodeau, Universite du Quebec a Montreal

**Abstract**
The Safe PatientsÆ Transfer Program (SPTP) was implemented in 1985 in acute- and long term care hospitals, in Quebec, Canada. This primary prevention program of back injuries aims at enabling health care workers, mostly nurses, at correctly analyze potentially risky situations, and identify and use appropriate remedial measures. The objectives of this study are: 1) to explicitly state the program theory 2) to measure the implementation level of SPTP and of alternate interventions 3) to evaluate effects 4) to estimate interactions between the program and the organizational context of
implementation on the program's effects 5) to determine the relation between costs and effects. This holistic evaluation requires a multi-design approach: case studies, surveys, and experimentation are combined. Comprehensive, in-site, evaluations are needed in order to make summative decisions, since there is no clear evidence of their efficacy despite the popularity of prevention programs such as the SPTP in industrialized countries.

**Poster 45: What Colleges of Education Are Doing to Prepare Pre-service Teachers to Partner with Parents and Communities**

**Presenter** Carolyn B Flanigan, CBF Consulting

**Abstract** The Illinois Family Education Center (IFEC) contracted with the Illinois Professional Learners' Partnership (IPLP) to establish what Colleges of Education at the five IPLP universities are doing to prepare pre-service teachers to partner with parents and communities. An e-mail survey of 20 COE faculty at each of the five IPLP universities was conducted in 2000 and a second more detailed survey was sent in April 2001. The importance of preparing pre-service teachers to partner with parents and communities was confirmed by 89% of the 2001 survey respondents and 95% felt the topic should be interspersed throughout the entire teacher education curriculum. But 62% thought their pre-service teacher graduates were either somewhat prepared or unprepared to partner with parents and communities. Focus groups of faculty, pre-service teachers, new teachers and mentor teachers were organized to expand on the survey data.

**Poster 46: Instrument Equivalence Across Ethnic Groups**

**Presenters** Pablo A Olmos-Gallo, Mental Health Corporation of Denver
Susan R Hutchinson, University of Northern Colorado

**Abstract** In this paper we examine the concept of instrument equivalence across different ethnic groups. We start by reviewing what instrument equivalence is, and its importance when comparing different ethnic groups for both self-report and observational measurement instruments. We then perform several statistical and psychometric techniques associated with instrument equivalence including Cronbach's alpha, Confirmatory Factor Analyses, and Rasch Analysis on observational data collected using the Colorado Client Assessment Record (developed by the Department of Human Services, State of Colorado) on a large sample of children and adults being served at the Mental Health Corporation of Denver during the fiscal year 2000-2001. The results of these analyses show that the factor structure for children and adults with primary diagnosis of major depression is different for different ethnic groups. We discuss the potential implications of these findings in terms of potential training issues and on real differences in symptom presence.

**Poster 47: Evaluating an initiative to Develop Protagonists Adolescents in Brazil: Challenges and Base-line Results**

**Presenters** Rogério R Silva, Aval Social and Health Program Evaluation
Thomaz K Chianca, Communication and Evaluation Inc

**Abstract** The poster will present the main results and discuss the major challenges faced by an evaluation team to plan and implement an external evaluation commissioned to establish a baseline data bank on competencies related to Unesco's Four Pillars of Education of adolescents participating on an initiative aiming to create a generation of motivated and prepared adolescents to work on sustainable development projects in their communities. The initiative (Alliance with the Adolescent) is developed in the poorest region of Brazil by local NGOs, supported by a consortium comprising Odebrecht Foundation, Kellogg Foundation, Ayrton Senna Institute and BNDES (Brazilian Bank for Social Development). Using a participatory approach, external consultants, working closely to funders and projects directors, accessed 1,890 adolescents and more than 350 parents and projects educators, through qualitative methods that included translating into observable abilities and competencies the educational concepts behind Unesco's Four Pillars of Education.

**Poster 48: Evaluating an Alternative Certification Program: Challenges, Methods, and Results**

**Presenter** Stephen P Newton, Los Angeles Unified School District

**Abstract** The poster will present the main results and discuss the major challenges faced by an evaluation team to plan and implement an external evaluation commissioned to establish a baseline data bank on competencies related to Unesco's Four Pillars of Education of adolescents participating on an initiative aiming to create a generation of motivated and prepared adolescents to work on sustainable development projects in their communities. The initiative (Alliance with the Adolescent) is developed in the poorest region of Brazil by local NGOs, supported by a consortium comprising Odebrecht Foundation, Kellogg Foundation, Ayrton Senna Institute and BNDES (Brazilian Bank for Social Development). Using a participatory approach, external consultants, working closely to funders and projects directors, accessed 1,890 adolescents and more than 350 parents and projects educators, through qualitative methods that included translating into observable abilities and competencies the educational concepts behind Unesco's Four Pillars of Education.

**Poster 49: Family Literacy Programs: A Systemic Process That Transforms Families**

**Presenter** Patricia B Keith, Southwest Educational Research Lab

**Abstract** For the past few decades Family Literacy Programs have sprung up all over the country. Going beyond the goals of Head Start and Even Start Programs, many believe that Family Literacy Programs are now the way to transform families and empower them with skills for a brighter future. Adult literacy and early childhood reading development often serve as the cornerstone for these programs. This poster will illustrate a ten step *getting to outcomes logic model* that can be used to develop a systemic process to help transform families and reform adult and early childhood programs. The model is based on previous research, evaluation, best practices, accountability, and collaboration (Wandersman, Imm, Chinman, & Kaftarian, 2000).

---
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Poster 50: The Use of Multiple Evaluation Methods for Program Assessment and Improvement
Presenter Phillip W. Graham, RTI International
Abstract The Juvenile Breaking the Cycle (JBC) program targets youthful offenders (N=315) with substance abuse problems and who are at high risk to re-offend. Specific programs and services include urinalysis testing, service coordination, treatment services, mental health services, drug court participation, and sanctions and incentives. To evaluate this program, RTI International designed an evaluation that collects data through three (3) evaluation components: process, outcome, and economic/cost. This presentation will focus on how multiple evaluation methods can be used to assess the effectiveness of the program and how findings from these methods can be used for program improvement. The process evaluation will assess the fidelity of program implementation; the outcome will assess changes in behavior as a function of services received; and the economic/cost component will assess the cost of operations. The integration of these findings will be discussed in the context of their utility for program improvement.

Poster 51: Results and Reflections: An Internal Evaluation of a Mentoring Project for African American and Latino Youth with Disabilities in Out-of-home Care
Presenters Kimberly M. Hall, University of Illinois at Chicago
Teresa-Garate Serafini, University of Illinois at Chicago
Javier Perez, University of Illinois at Chicago
Abstract This poster presents findings from an evaluation of a project that provided help-recruiting skills training and college student mentors to youth with the goal of decreasing involvement in school-dropout risk behaviors and facilitating goal setting and attainment. Participants were 12- to 14-year-old African American and Latino youth with disabilities who were in out-of-home care. Outcomes examined include dropout behaviors, academic performance, skill mastery, goal attainment, self-perception and life skills. I provide descriptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the data collection methods and instruments used in this study to supplement the evaluation results. Through lessons learned, I contrast the intuitive appeal of this intervention with the difficulties experienced during implementation. I derive these contrasts from my reflection as an internal evaluator and from the perspectives of mentors and mentees who participated in exit interviews. Finally, I suggest implications for future evaluations and service providers.

Poster 52: Evaluation of the English as a Second Language Program of the Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council
Presenter Dhaifallah Almatrodi, Western Michigan University
Abstract The evaluation examines the English as a Second Language Program at the Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council (GPLC) focusing on student achievement, goal attainment, satisfaction of the volunteers and students, and meeting the standards set by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Over the past several years, GPLC has seen a dramatic shift in the population it serves. 55% of its student population are ESL students where originally GPLC served only the Adult Basic Education population. The continuing influx of students and a general decline in numbers of trained volunteer tutors has added to the number of students waiting for services. GPLC has had to continually update its systems and programs to meet the needs of the clientele and stakeholder requirements. This is the first external evaluation of this accredited program that continues to respond to the changing demographics and needs of the adult learners it serves while striving for continuous program improvement.

Poster 53: Developing and Using a Logic Model for a Complex Community Literacy Initiative
Presenter Mary G. Williams, Mary Williams & Associates
Abstract Everybody Reads in Allen County (Indiana) is a collaboration of public school districts, private and parochial schools, pre-schools, an educational foundation, volunteer literacy organizations, the public library, and others, conducted under the leadership of a consortium of local funders with financial support from the Lilly Endowment. The goal of Everybody Reads is to increase the number of parents and caregivers who read to young children every day, to improve readiness for kindergarten among preschoolers, and to raise the scores of third graders on the language arts portion of a state test. As part of a formative evaluation and with active participation of stakeholders, we developed a unique logic model for the initiative. The model holistically and clearly depicts the chain of initial, intermediate and long-term outcomes for the project while delineating how each program partner contributes to the overall effort.

Poster 54: Successful Early Literacy Development Using Technology: The Case of the El Centrito de la Colonia Program
Presenters Mildred Murray-Ward, California Lutheran University
Annel Roche, El Centrito de la Colonia
Abstract The purpose of this poster session is to present research results on early language development from the evaluation of the El Centrito de la Colonia Early Literacy Project. The Project focuses on reading and language development through the use of technology (the Waterford Early Learning System) and teacher and parent led activities. The evaluation design involved the comparison of the El Centrito children's pre, post and follow-up assessment results with those of their comparable peers in local public preschools that do not use technology. The results revealed that the El Centrito children achieved strong statistically significant outcomes in reading readiness and language development. This presentation will include a description of the Project, evaluation
design and major achievement findings.

**Poster 55: Collaborative Evaluation of the Use of Drama and Technology to Improve Literacy in a School/University Partnership Program for Family Literacy**

**Presenters**
- Elizabeth R Landerholm, Northeastern Illinois University
- Jo Ann Karr, Northeastern Illinois University
- Selina Mush, Northeastern Illinois University
- Yi Hao, Northeastern Illinois University

**Abstract**
McCosh Even Start, a federally funded after-school project located at McCosh School in an inner city Chicago neighborhood, is a partnership between Northeastern Illinois University and the Chicago Public Schools. The four components of the family literacy program were (1) a parent/child after-school & Sat. program with computer, science, reading, writing, art activities, drama tutoring and field trips; (2) home visiting; (3) adult literacy component with computer, GED, video classes; (4) parent education which included career development skills, parenting workshops and field trips. Computer, video technology, drama-tutoring and photography were used as tools to develop literacy and document literacy progress of parents and children. To evaluate the results, professors, teachers, students, parents children and a videodocumenter collaborated to use a wide range of evaluation strategies and make sure all voices were heard. These strategies included video documentation and interviews, parent interest questionnaires, observations, book logs, photo collections, portfolios, informal reading inventories, parent self-evaluations, attendance data, parent report surveys, children's drawings, student and staff logs.

**Alternative Format 56: Evaluation Approaches as Cooking Ingredients: A Humorous Allegory With a Sweet(s) Evaluation Report Guaranteed**

**Presenter**
C Gerlinde Struhkamp, University of Minnesota

**Abstract**
In allusion to a quote from a program evaluation textbook in this presentation various evaluation approaches are compared to cooking ingredients. The ingredients (not the evaluation approaches) will be presented as a "poster": a 3-dimensional one. They tell much about the characteristics and pros and cons of the approaches and may amuse spectators. An unusual but enlightening and entertaining way to teach about numerous evaluation approaches and components—truly "edutaining".
Conference Session: Friday, November 8, 2002 – 8:00 am to 9:10 am

**Presidential Strand**

**No Learning Without Feedback: The Vital Partnership of Evaluation and Systems Thinking**

Plenary Session 500 to be held in Ballroom E  
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand  
Chair: Molly Engle, Oregon State University  
Speaker: John Sterman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Coffee and Tea Break: Coffee and tea are available on the main conference floor outside the ballrooms before and after the morning plenary.

Conference Session: Friday, November 8, 2002 – 9:25 am to 10:10 am

**Presidential Strand**

**Strategies for Promoting Use of Evaluation Results by School Administrators and Teachers Involved in a Large Multi-site Program Evaluation**

Demonstration Session 501 to be held in Ballroom A  
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG  
Chair: Stephanie K Siddens, Fairfax County Public Schools  
Presenters:  
Stephanie K Siddens, Fairfax County Public Schools  
Zhicheng Zhang, Fairfax County Public Schools

Abstract: A small internal evaluation office within a large school district has the responsibility for evaluating an expensive high profile early childhood program in twelve elementary schools. Although the office provides an annual evaluation report to the superintendent, school board, and school principals, the school-based staff implementing the program rarely had access to evaluation results and struggled to see the relevance of the data to their daily experience with students. In an effort to make the evaluation data more useful to school-based staff the office, with limited resources (evaluation staff and budget), developed strategies for reporting evaluation data to school-based staff and facilitating interpretation of data to promote learning and program improvement. This demonstration will take attendees through the steps the office took and address the factors that contributed to both the initial lack of use and later increased use of evaluation data in this context.

**Conference Committee Strand**

**Continuing the Discussion on High Stakes Testing**

Expert Lecture Session 503 to be held in Ballroom C  
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee  
Chair: Sandra M Mathison, University of Louisville  
Speaker: Gerald Bracey, Independent Consultant

Abstract: Although AEA has adopted a formal position statement on high stakes testing, such statements alone are not enough to encourage evaluators and others to engage in best practices. Additionally, there is a need for sustained ongoing dialogue about this very central evaluation issue in Pre-K through 12th grade education. This session will feature a brief presentation and opportunity to talk with well known educational researcher, Gerald Bracey. Bracey has been a research psychologist for the Educational Testing Service, associate director of the Institute for Child Study at Indiana University-Bloomington and served for nine years as the director of research, evaluation and testing for the Virginia Department of Education.
Preventing School Leaders for "Scientifically Based Research": What Role for the American Evaluation Association?
Think Tank Session 502 to be held in Ballroom B
Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG
Facilitators: Kenneth T Wilburn, University of North Florida
Sharon T Wilburn, University of North Florida
Abstract: According to a recent article in Education Week, the words "scientifically based research" appear more than 100 times in the 2002 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education act. The American Evaluation Association has been interested in facilitating the development of a culture based on the utilization of evaluation-research in education. While, with the "No Child Left Behind" act, there may be an opportunity to improve the use of evaluation-research, at the same time many questions need to be answered. The purpose of this think tank is to address these issues and focus on clarifying the formal and informal role(s) of the American Evaluation Association, its affiliates, and members. Specifically, participants will be asked to address the following question: What role, if any, should the American Evaluation Association have in preparing teachers, principals, and other school leaders, to meet the "scientifically based research" requirements of the 2002 ESEA act.

Evaluating Cultural Competence and Culturally Competent Evaluation in the Human Services Field
Panel Session 504 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG
Chair: Melva V Thompson-Robinson, Florida A&M University
Discussant: Rodney K Hopson, Duquesne University
Abstract: Evaluating Cultural Competence and Culturally Competent Evaluation in the Human Services Field

Developing Standards, Principles, and Guidelines for Culturally Competent Evaluation in the Human Services Field
Presenter: Saumitra Sengupta, City & County of San Francisco

Wireless Data Transfer: The Results Of a Three-month Beta Test Of Wireless Data Transfer In a Not-for-profit Setting
Demonstration Session 505 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG
Facilitators: Steven Hadesman, Center for Drug-Free Living
Roberta Marowitz, Center for Drug-Free Living
Abstract: This demonstration and discussion will incorporate the results of a unique beta test of a Wireless Data Transfer method performed at a not-for-profit mental health setting for a Government sponsored Family Strengthening Grant. The demonstration will include a brief overview regarding data input enabling program participants to respond to a series of questions concerning attitudes and lifestyle choices at two different time intervals (pretest and posttest) on a hand-held portable device. This will be followed by a brief overview of how the results from the questionnaires were stored and transferred to the program evaluator through a conventional landline and wireless portal. The discussion portion will follow and will include an outline of the benefits encountered, limitations revealed, concerns expressed and a summation of the participant feedback from the beta test. Uses for and applications of wireless data transfer will be discussed at both the design and implementation level.

Toward More Effective Stakeholder Dialogue: An Experimental Test of Two Strategies and a Consideration of More Evidence-based Evaluation Theory
Expert Lecture Session 506 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG
Speakers: Bernadette Campbell, Pennsylvania State University
Melvin M Mark, Pennsylvania State University
Abstract: Numerous evaluation scholars have highlighted potential benefits of stakeholder dialogue. House & Howe and others describe effective stakeholder dialogue as "inclusive" and "equitable", with "reciprocity", "tolerance", and avoidance of "narrow self-interest". Yet, questions remain about
how to create effective dialogue. With stakeholders engaged in priority setting, we experimentally tested the effect of two factors from the literature. Participants, in pairs representing different stakeholder groups, at random were (a) asked to think of their own stakeholder group or a mixed group, and (b) given or not given explicit instructions on how to approach the discussion with the goal of achieving mutual understanding. These factors influenced dialogue participants' perceptions of and satisfaction with the interaction, as well the actual dialogue process. We discuss how experimental tests can provide evaluators with evidence-based advice concerning better ways to structure stakeholder dialogue, and more generally how various kinds of empirical tests can better inform evaluation theories.

Threshold Tool: Planning and Evaluating Educational Technology Integration Programs
Demonstration Session 507 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG
Facilitators
LeCia J Barker, University of Colorado at Boulder
Tim Best, Ohio Schoolnet Commission
Rebecca Zittle, Center for Educational Evaluation and Research
Marilyn Smith, Ypsilon Associates
Abstract
The goal of the "Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology" (PT3) program is to equip teachers graduating from licensure programs with understanding of how to effectively integrate technology to maximize student learning. In teacher preparation programs, however, major organizational change is required both at the level of the department or school as well as in the larger system in which it resides. Evaluation of systemic reform is complex and made more so by technology, a changing target. Unfortunately, few resources are available for evaluators. The authors will demonstrate and discuss a tool developed as part of "PT3-L3, Learning, Linking and Leading," a catalyst grant administered by Wexford, Inc., for planning and evaluating a program's progress. Embedded in the tool are the threshold conditions necessary for graduating preservice teachers with the required knowledge and indicators stakeholders rate for current status and importance. The tool can be adapted to other technology programs.

Developing a System to Monitor and Evaluate the Mainstreaming of Gender in an International Organization
Panel Session 508 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair
Donna R Podems, The Union Institute
Discussant
Mari Clarke, Center for Development and Population Activities
Session Abstract
There is a growing recognition that unequal access of women and men to productive resources and essential public services is a major barrier to social and economic development. Most international development agencies now have policies intended to combat these inequalities through integrating ("mainstreaming") gender in their programs' design and implementation. This session describes efforts by the World Bank to create a system to monitor and evaluate the implementation of its recently approved Gender Mainstreaming Strategy. The first panelist will present the World Bank's gender monitoring and evaluation system and assess experience to date in the implementation of the M&E strategy. The second presenter will discuss some challenges to introducing a gender M&E system in different geographical and cultural contexts. A discussant will critically assess the World Bank's approach and draw lessons for other organizations seeking to evaluate the efficacy of social development programs in areas such as gender, indigenous peoples and poverty alleviation.

Progress in Monitoring and Evaluating the Mainstreaming of Gender in the World Bank
Presenter
Lucia Fort, The World Bank
Abstract
This presentation will discuss the efforts by the World Bank to create a system to monitor and evaluate the implementation of its recently approved Gender Mainstreaming Strategy. The Bank's Gender Strategy affirms that work on gender issues needs to be country-specific and client-led: gender analysis is integral to understanding how best to fight poverty and promote growth across sectors; and the Bank needs to play a supportive but pro-active role vis-a-vis borrowers. These principles present challenges as well as opportunities for carrying out monitoring and evaluation, such as how to achieve comparability between the assessments from different regions and countries, and how to assess the impact of Bank interventions at the ground level. The presentation will cover the gender M&E system, including guidelines and monitoring tools, and how its design addresses the corporate, regional, country and project levels. It will also assess the experience to date in the implementation of the M&E strategy.

Challenges in Evaluating the Impacts and Effectiveness of Gender Mainstreaming: Lessons from the Field
Presenter
Michael Bamberger, Independent Consultant
Abstract

This presentation will draw lessons from the field to identify some of the barriers to evaluating the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming. Issues covered will include: (a) cultural barriers to gender mainstreaming, (b) limitations on conventional survey methods for collection and analysis of the data required for gender impact assessment, (c) problems in collecting sex-disaggregated data, and (d) professional and institutional barriers to gender analysis. Another set of issues concerns the different evaluation paradigms used by international agencies, national governments, academics, research consultants and NGOs; and how these different perceptions and approaches complicate collaborative research on gender. Illustrations will be drawn from field experiences in Eritrea, Bangladesh, Peru and [Egypt], and from the efforts to incorporate gender into the evaluation of poverty reduction strategies in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

A Methodology of Designing an Effective Training Evaluation

Demonstration Session 509 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Facilitators
Winifred King, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Ted Duncan, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Abstract
Evaluating the effectiveness of training is important as well as challenging. Most training evaluations resemble satisfaction surveys providing little utility in improving training design and delivery. The purpose of this workshop is to describe an evaluation methodology that can be used by trainers and evaluators to design and implement an utility-based evaluation of a training program. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) framework for program evaluation in public health was used to guide the methodology. The CDC framework for evaluation consists of six-steps: 1) engage stakeholders; 2) describe the program; 3) focus the evaluation design; 4) gather credible evidence; 5) justify conclusions; and 6) ensure use and lessons learned. The process in which this evaluation methodology was developed will be illustrated by a case-study in which a team of CDC trainers designed and implemented an evaluation of their HIV Prevention Counseling Course. The strengths and challenges of this methodology will be discussed along with lessons learned and recommendations for future use.

Empowering Systems Through Service-learning: Evaluation as Instruction

Panel Session 511 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair
Robert Shumer, Independent Consultant

Session Abstract
This session is about an effort underway in Mississippi to create an evaluation system for a state program that relies on college students and courses for the bulk of data collection and analysis. Using principles of service-learning, you will learn how faculty, students, K-12 school districts, and community agencies collaborate to both develop and evaluate after-school programs. The project director will describe the process of recruiting and developing faculty and courses which serve as the backbone of the evaluation effort. Faculty from a university in Mississippi will explain how they have incorporated evaluation processes into their courses such that the regular work that students do in the community collects data for the evaluation. Simply put, this is an effort to use principles of service-learning instruction to develop a self-sustaining evaluation system that produces both better instruction and better evaluation. The ultimate goal of the two-year project is to create an infrastructure of classes that will serve as the main part of the evaluation system for years to come. In the presentation we will discuss the theory, the successes, and the challenges of the system. There will be an opportunity for the audience to probe both the concepts and the implementation, as well as to discuss possible implementation of such a program in their own setting.

Developing an Empowerment Plan Using Principles/Courses in Service-learning
Presenter
Robert Shumer, Independent Consultant

Developing and Administering a Statewide Program Using Service Learning
Presenter
Thomas Schnaubelt, University of Southern Mississippi

Developing Courses/Programs at the University Level to Support Evaluation Work as Part of Regular Courses
Presenter
Debby Chessin, University of Mississippi

Coordinating a School/Community Partnership Using Service-Learning as One Method of Evaluation
Presenter
Sue Turner, University of Mississippi

The Multiple Contexts of Cross-site Community-based Outcome Evaluations of HIV Prevention Interventions

Panel Session 512 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Panelists will discuss the multiple contexts that influence the conceptualization, planning, and implementation of cross-site outcome evaluations of individual- and group-level interventions and prevention case management carried out by nine community-based organizations (CBOs) directly funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). We will review the respective roles and responsibilities of external consultants and CBOs in the evaluation, with emphasis on the contexts that affect decisions about evaluation protocols and methods. We will focus on such issues as the differences between national and local evaluation questions and stakeholder needs, challenges in cross-site evaluations of unique local programs, and the relationship between program management and program evaluation. Panelists will share their perspectives on outcome evaluation, focusing on how findings can have systemic impacts at the federal and local levels.

Can Evaluation Reform a Government Process to Increase Substance Abuse Prevention Provider Capacity?

Think Tank Session 513 to be held in the Conference Theater room

Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG

Chair: Craig W LeCroy, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc
Facilitators: Wallace Beauchamp, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc
Allison Titcomb, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc
Duane Neff, Governor's Division of Drug Policy
Rudy Navarro, Governor's Division of Drug Policy

Abstract: This think tank will address the issue of how evaluation can be used to reform state government approaches to grant making, resulting in increased capacity within prevention provider agencies in regards to evaluation, program delivery, recruitment and retention, and other related areas. The Arizona Governor's Division of Drug Policy (GDDP) and LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. have worked together for the last two years evaluating several different substance abuse prevention programs. In addition to providing program specific information, the two agencies used the experience to modify GDDP's grant-making approach. This new approach is designed to better position the providers to take advantage of existing technical expertise and to better use evaluation to increase capacity. GDDP and LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. presenters will facilitate the breakout groups to address how this experience can be adapted to other situations, both local and statewide. Groups will look at the issue from both the evaluator and government agency positions.

Roundtables: Intercultural

Roundtables Session 514 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair: Mary Church

Table A: Reforming Minority Scholarship Programs

Presenters: Colleen L Coulter, University of Rochester
Michael Wischnowski, University of Rochester

Abstract: This roundtable discussion will focus on reforming scholarship programs to better suit needs of minority graduate students. The particular evaluation to be discussed involves minority graduate students working toward a master's degree in education. The following questions guide the evaluation being presented: 1) Based on the mission or purpose of the program, what are the priority goals of the scholarship program? 2) Are the scholarship program and the teacher education program meeting the needs of their minority population? 3) How can admissions professionals reach out to the minority population and encourage interest in and increase awareness of the scholarship program? The needs of the minority student population, specifically those pursuing the teaching profession, along with the interests of admissions professionals and members of the higher education community striving to improve minority access to higher education, will be addressed in this presentation.

Table B: From Colors to Transnational Boundaries: Expanding the Global Reach of the Evaluation Profession

Presenter: Fernand A de los Reyes, University of Tokyo

Abstract: While it can be argued that there is a need for people-of-color empowerment through capacity building, there is also a strong imperative to shed the dominance of donor-driven perspectives and evaluation designs in a developing country to expand the global reach of the evaluation profession.
This paper highlights the importance of reforming the evaluation requirements of international institutions through a case presentation in a Philippine development project. The case emphasizes the need for reform to streamline the evaluation process of international institutions and build regional capabilities for professionals involved in evaluation. People-of-color empowerment has been strategically identified to include: 1) Buddy mentoring and power-sharing system; and 2) Fellowships and Exchange Program. The paper concludes with the establishment of a Trust Fund for developing country representatives in annual AEA Conferences to expand the global reach of the evaluation profession.

### Table C: Evaluating Leadership Development Interventions in Global Health: A Framework Examining Success and Meaning

**Presenter:** John T Grove, Public Health Institute

**Abstract:** Leadership development is becoming a predominant paradigm in international development. We evaluate these interventions to improve activities that sustain the achievement of positive outcomes for organizations, communities, and countries by individuals. Leadership does not occur at a static point in time, but through a multitude of experiences. The relationship between an intervention and observable result is not direct. Evaluation approaches must explore learning, and, job and career performance. Evaluation experts and practitioners in global health leadership were invited to come together by the Population Leadership Program in March 2002 to react and expand on a conceptual framework. An expanded, flexible, conceptually valid framework emerged. The purpose of this roundtable is to share this framework and gather feedback from a broad group of interested parties. Key questions include: Do the basic concepts hold?, How have others evaluated human capacity programs?

### Table D: Trust the Process: Lessons from an Environmental Organization in South Africa

**Presenter:** Thomas D Cousins, University of Cape Town

**Abstract:** Educo Africa is non-governmental organisation based in Cape Town, South Africa, that provides leadership development through outdoor-based experiential learning. Educo's intention was to improve its services. During 2001, the organisation put itself through a range of participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises that strengthened the organisation's capacity to reflect on its practices and apply any insight. By clarifying specific outcomes and objectives of its programmes, Educo recognised the crucial role that partner organisations play in achieving their desired outcomes. Using a small sample of past participants and staff, the researcher used questionnaires and structured and informal interviews to form the basis of a formative evaluation. A formative, process-oriented approach was used in helping to clarify the objectives and outcomes of Educo Africa programmes, and thereby strengthen the purpose and capacity of the organisation.

### Table E: The Ayrton Senna Institute's Contribution to the Evaluation Field in Brazil

**Presenters:** Thomas K Chianca, Communication and Evaluation Inc; Eduardo Marino, VITAE; Margareth Goldenberg, Ayrton Senna Institute

**Abstract:** The Ayrton Senna Institute (IAS), since 1996, started to make systematic efforts to develop an evaluation culture within the organization, and to strengthen the field of evaluation in the Brazilian Third Sector. These efforts included, among others, (a) developing a manual on project evaluation (first 1,000 copies sold-out - new edition to be released early 2002); (b) fostering an evaluation culture among grantees/partners, offering support for planning and implementing internal evaluations; (c) training IAS’s staff members on evaluation (now virtually all programs have evaluation components); and (d) developing a methodology to evaluate programs based on Unesco’s concept of the Four Pillars of Education (applied in two major programs supported by IAS and been considered for use by other organizations). IAS’s work on evaluation was the recipient of the 2001 Best Practices in Social Work and Social Services Award of the Cambridge Scientific Abstracts in the category of Program Evaluation.

### Table F: I Can Do That! An Evaluation of an Astronomy Outreach Program for Navajo (Dine) and Hopi Students

**Presenter:** Denice Ward Hood, Northern Arizona University

**Abstract:** This paper will present information on the ongoing evaluation of an astronomy outreach program for Navajo (Dine) and Hopi 5th through 8th grade students. The methods used, unexpected outcomes, and the findings to date will be presented. While relevant for evaluators working in similar settings, the issues of culturally responsive pedagogy and evaluation have implications for a variety of other evaluation contexts.

### Table G: The Development of a Survey Instrument Based on a Formative Evaluative Process

**Presenters:** Launcelot I Brown, Duquesne University; Michael Perry, Western Virginia Public Education Consortium

**Abstract:** The formative evaluative process is an approach to instrument development that through successive iterations of the instrument ensures that the final product version is contextually relevant to the system that is being evaluated. The approach was adopted in order to meet the challenge of developing an instrument that was contextualized to Trinidad and Tobago, while at the same time giving a sense of ownership to the various stakeholders. The process begins with the literature review for an identification of variables and the development of the initial instrument. The initial instrument is taken to a panel of experts for their input. The repeated input from panels of experts representing the various stakeholders will result in successive iterations of the instrument, culminating in agreement on the final instrument. During this session, we will demonstrate the development of the Teacher Demand and Supply
Survey Instrument which was developed as part of an evaluation project for the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education. The final instrument was the result of eight iterations while in Trinidad and Tobago. Each step of the process will be explained and demonstrated, and participants will be shown an example of the result of each iteration.

Assessing Needs in the Health Care Sector

MultiPaper Session 515 to be held in the Kennedy room

Sponsored by the Needs Assessment TIG

Chair
Uyen H Bui, AIDS Project Los Angeles

Measuring Community Based Organization’s (CBO’s) Capacity to Perform Evaluation for HIV Prevention and Care Programs: A Needs Assessment Study

Presenters
Uyen H Bui, AIDS Project Los Angeles
Matt G Mitchler, AIDS Project Los Angeles
Ronald Brooks, University of California at Los Angeles
Henry Anaya, University of California at Los Angeles
Miquel A Chion, AIDS Project Los Angeles
Summa Shariff, AIDS Project Los Angeles

Abstract
As part of a capacity building initiative, Los Angeles County (LAC) Department of Health Services awarded funding to AIDS Project Los Angeles (APLA) and the UCLA Center for HIV Identification, Prevention, and Treatment Services (CHIPTS) to develop an evaluation training program for CBOs in LAC. A cross-sectional survey was piloted and mailed to key program staff at local CBOs providing HIV/AIDS services. Our objectives were to measure self-reported knowledge, skills, technical capacity, and training interest in regards to evaluation and to identify barriers to performing evaluation activities. Agencies were selected using stratified sampling based on the number and types of contracts (prevention, care services, or both) and the number of sites per agency. Data were collected during March and April 2002. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 10.1 software. Study findings, program development, and lessons learned will be presented.

Community Landscape Asset Mapping: An Innovative Approach to Community-level Needs Assessment

Presenters
L Michele Issel, University of Illinois at Chicago
Lisabeth M Searing, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract
The purpose of this presentation is to disseminate an innovative strategy to assess communities, based on a philosophical approach. The strategy, called Community Landscape Asset Mapping (CLAM), provides a structured approach to community assessment that can be used in conjunction with more traditional data sources. The CLAM allows for investigating the nature of geography and its relationship to communities and personal health. The geography of health involves both space and place and may add key explanatory and mediating variables relating to variations and disparities in chronic disease and health. The paper contributes to the needs assessment session by expanding the realm of needs assessment for program planning. Because using the CLAM can be done from a participatory perspective, it fits with the theme of reforming systems, in this case, the community as a system.

The Many Faces of Title II Program Evaluation: Contexts, Systems and Evaluation Strategies

Panel Session 516 to be held in the Jefferson room

Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG

Chair
Susan A Tucker, Evaluation & Development Associates

Session Abstract
The theme of this conference is particularly relevant for the challenges facing evaluators of USDE Title II projects. Title II is charged with enhancing teacher quality in the context of high-need schools across the US who are experiencing an ever increasing crisis in attracting (and holding) quality teachers. Title II programs are well positioned to explore the role of systemic contexts in framing evaluation questions, informing the selection of evaluation methods, directing evaluation efforts, and using evaluation findings. This session is designed to share evaluation learnings regarding three Title II projects that have been operating for a period ranging from two to four years. Besides the context of time, evaluation will be explored in terms of contexts of resources, systemic support mechanisms, geography of need (rural and urban schools) as well as type of institutions represented (statewide model, large university collaborating with a network of 23 PDS sites, and a small university model working with 3 PDS sites).

Presenter
Nancy Shapiro, University System of Maryland

Abstract
Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice Chancellor, University System of Maryland, is project director of Project LINC, one of the largest projects funded by Title II, and will share her experiences with designing and building collaborative partnerships across three universities, one community college and
the largest school district in Maryland.

Presenter: Roy Weaver, Ball State University

Roy Weaver, Dean, Teachers College, Ball State University, will address the issues of institutionalizing this systemic change project by a large university who works with a 23 member PDS network and how he is aligning project efforts with a new college-wide data driven decision making system designed to be consistent with NCATE and state assessment and accreditation requirements.

Presenter: Charlotte Reed, Indiana University Northwest

Charlotte Reed, UTEP Executive Director, Indiana University Northwest, will address the challenges of being a small project director working with three districts who are facing continued budget reductions yet tasked with recruiting quality teachers.

Presenter: Kathy Price, US Department of Education

Abstract: Kathy Price is the USDE Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Program for States and Partnerships Program Officer for all three projects and will talk about federal needs and uses of program evaluation within the contexts of these very different projects.

**Increasing the Selectivity of Sustainable Development Checklists by Merging, Data Base Advanced Boolean Processing and Non Parametric Statistical Tests**

Demonstration Session 517 to be held in the Lincoln room

Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG

Facilitators: Henri Masson, Intelligence & Strategy for the Environment
              Caroline Roufosse, Intelligence & Strategy for the Environment

Abstract: The present paper focus on an innovative method for assessing compliance between 'policy sources' (policy papers, concepts, criteria) and statements related to several representative project descriptions or company performance description (called her after ‘initiatives’). The process happens in several successive steps. The first one consists mainly in submitting the wording (in the broad sense, including also fuzzy descriptions) of both categories of documents to a dichotomic cross check (‘is this particular concept covered or not in this document?’), attributing a compliance score to each initiative, ranking the initiatives based on the sum of ranks and their deviation towards the average sum of ranks. The outcome is a split of the initiatives in good, bad and average ones. Non parametric statistical tests are used to check the homogeneity of the ‘policy sources’, and the legitimacy of splitting the ‘initiatives’ in three categories. The second step consists in advanced Boolean analysis of the global databank (matrix ‘sources’ vs ‘initiatives’), in order to isolate the discriminating criteria of the ‘sources’: the ones (quite) always met by the good projects AND (quite) never met by the bad ones. The result is a very discriminating list of ‘source’ criteria that allows to class a given new initiative, ex ante, as good or bad, based upon the ‘ex postè experience, gained from existing related initiatives, and this based only on the wording used in the considered ‘initiative’ presentation. The method is illustrated, as a case, on 27 ‘initiatives’ of local development submitted to 10 ‘source’ lists totalising more than 600 criteria, leading to a reduced list of 65 discriminating criteria. The final test for a ‘good’ initiative, in this specific case, being simply to comply with at least 50% of the ‘shortlisted’ criteria.

**International Collaborations: Special Challenges for Evaluators**

Demonstration Session 518 to be held in the Roosevelt room

Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG

Facilitators: Laura J. Collins, University of Washington
              Chia-Lin Huang, University of Washington
              Tamara Walser, University of Washington
              Jennifer Harris, University of Washington

Abstract: As an evaluator, what are your challenges when half of the program participants speak a language other than your own? International collaborations in higher education programs provide opportunities for substantial college student development. The evaluator’s dilemma is to gather quality evaluation data and to disseminate useful information. Understanding historical information and cultural perspectives of participants at partner institutions aids the evaluator in gathering relevant data and making accurate judgements. In this session, participants will share information concerning international evaluation practices and presenters will demonstrate uses of current technology as information gathering tools.

**The Power of Peers: Engaging Program Staff as Evaluators and Peer Mentors in Evaluation**

Demonstration Session 520 to be held in the Fairfax room

Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG

Facilitator  Sue Lin Yee, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Abstract  CDC's National Tobacco Control Program recommends that states and territories allocate 10 percent of funds for program evaluation to focus program priorities, benchmark progress over time, and set targets for accountability. The CDC Framework for Program Evaluation was developed to provide a systematic guide for evaluation planning, implementation, and use. In addition to the six integral steps for program evaluation, the framework outlines four groups (utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy) of 30 standards that were adopted from the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. This demonstration will discuss the practical application of the Program Evaluation Standards within the context of evaluating comprehensive tobacco control programs. The applicability of the standards under each of the six steps of the evaluation framework will be discussed, and examples will be drawn from the tobacco control context that provide states and territories with guidelines for assessing and improving their evaluation activities.
Management of Evaluation Projects
Panel Session 521 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG
Chair Scott Davies, American Institutes for Research
Discussant Geraldina Villalobos-Quezada, Western Michigan University
Session Abstract Project Management is often considered both an art and a science. Projects are plagued with common problems including incomplete requirements, lack of client involvement and resources, tight timelines and budgets and unrealistic expectations on the part of the client. Managers of Evaluation Projects must contend with these same issues plus some unique challenges specific to evaluation. This session will consist of a three papers in which project managers will share their efforts, successes and failures in managing different types of evaluation projects. The overall goal of this session will be to leverage lessons learned and best practices in the Management of Evaluation Projects.

Program Evaluation Management: The Benefits of Collaboration
Presenters Scott Davies, American Institutes for Research
John Simpkins, Battelle Memorial Institute
Abstract This case study describes the management of a two-year evaluation of a large State’s gifted education program from the client and contractor points of view. The study illustrates the challenges and opportunities presented in managing a Statewide education evaluation, with multiple program and evaluation constituencies and competing goals. The outcome of the study focuses on the utility of collaboration between the client and contractor project managers at all stages of the evaluation: planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, and follow-up.

Challenges in Managing the Unknown: Developing the Evaluation Plan and Contract for a Pilot Project to Improve Utilization of Health Care Services by Families of At-risk Children
Presenter Maura Harrington, Lodestar Management/Research Inc
Abstract Project management of an evaluation contract can be particularly difficult when the program under study is evolving and is subject to a number of external and internal influences û from funder¢s requirements to service recipient preferences. This becomes even more complex when the program is a one that is launched by a public private hybrid organization and was designed by a committee process. This case study will provide an examination of the challenges in managing the expectations of the client, the funder and program partners in designing an evaluation that satisfies the needs of various stakeholders¢ and at the same time is a cost effective and feasible evaluation project.
Conference Session: Friday, November 8, 2002 - 10:20 am to 11:05 am

**Presidential Strand**

AEA 2002 Student Travel Award Winners focusing on the conference theme: Evaluation: A Systemic Process that Reforms Systems

MultiPaper Session 523 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand

**Designing, Implementing, and Reporting Evaluations in a Systemic Context**

Presenter Mei Chin Chin, Florida State University

How Theories of Systemic Change Relate to Evaluation and the Role of Evaluator’s In Systemic Reform

Presenter Mukaria J Itang’ata, Western Michigan University

**Conference Committee Strand**

Evaluating the Ship as It Is Being Built: The Role of Evaluation During Program Design and Planning

Think Tank Session 525 to be held in Ballroom C
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee

Chair Pennie G Foster-Fishman, Michigan State University
Facilitators W Thomas Summerfelt, Michigan State University
Leena Mangrulkar, WK Kellogg Foundation
Jim McHale, WK Kellogg Foundation
Katie Fitzgerald, WK Kellogg Foundation
Cherise Brandell, WK Kellogg Foundation

Abstract As social programming has come to value the integration of evaluation research in their design, the involvement of evaluation in the early stages of program design and planning is becoming more commonplace. This paradigm shift is mostly due to shrinking resources, the rising value of outcomes-based funding, and increased sophistication of consumers of data. This paradigm shift has led evaluators to work as more equal participants and less as experts/consultants/leaders. This change in roles reflects the need to balance and prioritize the various aspects of programming/articulation or establishment of vision, communication, implementation, engagement, and evaluation. The current session seeks to engage participants in a dialogue focused on articulating and clarifying the role of evaluation in the design and planning stages of programming for systemic change. Experiences from the “Yes we can” comprehensive community initiative funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation will be used to open the dialogue.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

Focus on the Feedback Loop: Logic Models for Evaluation Planning and Program Improvement

Demonstration Session 524 to be held in Ballroom B
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG

Chair Thomas J Chapel, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Presenter Goldie MacDonald, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Abstract Logic models are often used to make visible a theory of change, describe important components of a program, identify target outcomes, refine evaluation questions, and prioritize data needs. With a growing emphasis on the utility of evaluation efforts, creating a practical feedback loop helps to ensure that key findings are translated into improved practice. The feedback loop represents the action of integrating the results of an evaluation back into the program to reform processes toward increased efficiency and/or impact. The focus on creating a feedback loop requires an understanding that the evaluation may speak to accountability, as well as fuel strategic changes in program processes. Real-world strategies for insuring the use of evaluation findings via a feedback loop will be presented for discussion. Examples and lessons learned from national, state, and local tobacco use prevention and control programs will be explained in detail for easy application in diverse settings.

Evaluate or Perish: A Social Service Agency Survival Guide
Demonstration Session 526 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG
Facilitator        Carl F Brun, Wright State University
Abstract           The purpose of this demonstration is to give clinical and administrative social service workers a model for conducting conceptually sound evaluations. Persons at all systems levels in an agency can contribute to evaluation. Often, politics and ethics become barriers to conducting program evaluation rather than lack of evaluation skills, which can be easily taught. The decision flowchart below can help social service staff carry out conceptually sound evaluations: Can this program be evaluated? Do we agree on who will oversee the evaluation? Do we agree on the overall evaluation questions? Do we agree on how to answer the questions? Do we agree on how to report the answers to the questions? Do we agree on how to use the results of the evaluation? The presenter will utilize the literature and his own experiences as an evaluator to discuss the choices to arrive at an affirmative answer to each question above.

Use of Wearable and Mobile Computers for Data Accessing and Collection: Systematic Ways to Help Evaluators in the Field
Demonstration Session 527 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG
Facilitator        Carolyn Rude-Parkins, University of Louisville
Abstract           The purpose of this demonstration is to show the advantages and limitations of different wearable and mobile technologies for accessing and collecting data. The presenters will use the results of an investigation measuring the effects of this type of machines on users. First, the different components of a wearable computer and a pocket PC will be showed to the audience. The procedures for setting up both computers will be demonstrated. The use of head-mounted monitors and one-hand keyboards will be presented Second, different software applications will be presented in action with a focus on situations in which mobile technologies could benefit evaluators in the field such as observation of subjects, accessing databases, or collecting data. Third, some results of research conducted by the presenters in the field of mobile technologies will be presented with an emphasis on recommendations for best practices for evaluators.

The High Stakes Testing Constraints on Evaluation in School Districts
Think Tank Session 528 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Facilitators        Sandra M Mathison, University of Louisville
                     Marco A Munoz, Jefferson County Public Schools
Abstract            This think tank session will provide an overview of the ways school district evaluators perceive state mandated and high stakes testing to direct evaluation activities in schools and school districts. The co-chairs will describe the contemporary and historical socio-political contexts that conflate student achievement testing and evaluation. They will present the findings from a survey of public school district evaluators. These findings will illustrate the ways in which a high stakes testing environment constrains the selection of evaluation problems, the approaches to evaluation, the kinds of data considered compelling and how evaluation information is reported and disseminated. This information will be made available to potential attendees ahead of time and allowing the think tank to focus on reactions from evaluators and brainstorming responses and reactions to equating student achievement testing with educational evaluation.

Role of Stakeholders in the Evaluation of Mental Health Services
MultiPaper Session 530 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair               Astrid Hendricks-Smith, The California Endowment
Consumer Empowerment for the Mentally Ill: Can We Measure it?
Presenter          Sue Tripathi, Colorado Access
Abstract            This presentation focuses on a local consumer empowerment model where mentally ill clients are partners in the development and implementation of services. This session will focus on four themes: 1) organization history; 2) project goals and objectives; 3) short and long-term outcomes; 4) empowerment and partnerships with consumers. Additionally, the presentation will also review consumer empowerment models for mentally ill clients, and
limitations to consumer empowerment measurements for specific populations. Specifically, the presentation will focus on some preliminary findings (based on an established consumer empowerment instrument and focus groups).

**The Role of Stakeholder Interest on the Implementation and Interpretation of the Broward County Mental Health Court Evaluation**

**Presenters**
- Annette McGaha, University of South Florida
- Roger A Boothroyd, University of South Florida
- John Petrila, University of South Florida
- Norman Poythress, University of South Florida

**Abstract**
Mental health courts have emerged over the past several years as a way to address the needs of persons with mental illness and substance abuse who are involved with the criminal justice system. The purpose of this presentation is to discuss stakeholder interest and how these interests can shape the formation, implementation and interpretation of evaluations of such courts. This discussion has bearing on the use of evaluation for system reform because applying findings from evaluations of mental health courts can involve a focus on the reform of several inter-related systems. Key decisions need to be made about which questions to ask, which methods to apply, and which data sources to use to address the questions and need for reform of these various systems. Our experience evaluating the Broward County Mental Health Court (MHC), the nation’s first such court, is the basis for this discussion.

**How to Conduct Site Visits**

**Demonstration Session 531 to be held in the Potomac III room**

**Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG**

**Chair**
- Frances Lawrenz, University of Minnesota

**Presenters**
- Frances Lawrenz, University of Minnesota
- Nanette M Keiser, Western Michigan University

**Abstract**
This session will walk the participants through a site visit handbook designed to help both novice and experienced site visitors. The handbook is based on our visits to 13 sites of the National Science Foundation’s Advanced Technological Education Program. The handbook covers the following topics: identify purposes, select sites and visitors, prepare protocols, conduct the site visit, and use the data. The concepts presented are not only described but are also illustrated through two continuing examples, one simple and one complex. The basic message is that a site visit is an important data gathering method, but it must be carefully planned and executed for the data to be useful. The session will emphasize developing purposes for the visits and then using a systematic approach to inform all of the other processes involved. Advice will be provided on how to manage visits in order to assure the usability of the information.

**Evaluation and Social Justice: Alternative Approaches to Evaluation Inquiry and Representation**

**Demonstration Session 532 to be held in the Potomac IV room**

**Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Jennifer C Greene, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Presenters**
- Kate Walker, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Merrill Chandler, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Abstract**
This presentation is about our experience designing and negotiating an evaluation plan to assess the efforts of a small, liberal arts college to advance and support the inclusion of students from “under-represented groups” in science courses and career trajectories. We saw this as a vital context within which to pursue important questions and concerns related to value issues of diversity and difference. We explore issues faced in positioning and conducting the evaluation to politically engage with the politics and values. In particular, we consider what a collaborative, participatory evaluation that uses dialogue as a process of reflection and engagement contributes to an evaluation context imbued with value issues of diversity and difference.

"Plays Well with Others:" Evaluating Multi-agency Comprehensive Community Initiatives

**MultiPaper Session 533 to be held in the Potomac V room**

**Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Mildred Murray-Ward, California Lutheran University

**Evaluation as Technical Assistance for System Change**

**Presenters**
- Lorinda R Arella, Organizational Research and Development Associates Ltd
This paper describes how the evaluation component of a federally funded program to expand HIV/AIDS prevention programs in communities of color came to serve as change agent and partner to four collaborating agencies responsible for project development and implementation. The funder’s rationale was that many grass-roots organizations with the greatest access to communities with accelerating HIV infection rates need various kinds of capacity building technical assistance (TA) before they can effectively expand or initiate effective prevention programs. TA would take the form of fundraising, fiscal management, board development, planning, training, evaluation, and program development. The Project received $4 million in federal funding from over 3 years to provided critical TA to New York City community based organizations (CBOs) that offer a variety of services to people of color. The federal funding source mandated that the project reach target numbers of concrete outcomes specific to HIV/AIDS prevention, as a result of providing a range of types of TA within three years. Outcomes were to include: minority staff effectively trained, HIV/AIDS prevention program proposals written, submitted and funded, HIV/AIDS prevention programs initiated or expanded, and strengthened networks established within communities of color. Because the project involved substantial funds generated through an ethnically based lobbying campaign, this was a highly visible and politically charged project. The evaluation design for this project had to be capable of monitoring and assessing the impact of TA provision by more than thirty TA providers from four different collaborating agencies and who would be working with a diverse range of CBO types. Within this context of so many stakeholders and project challenges even the data collection instruments became a critical focal point for partner discussion and, sometimes, internal project conflict.

This paper describes how traditional evaluation strategies and activities can provide unique opportunities for informed discussion among collaborating agencies and project staff. Evaluators can choose to fulfill primary responsibilities in ways that can also maximize critical team-building interactions and systemic organizational change. Thoughtfulness about the design of the evaluation and how to implement it can also have a critical impact on key project implementation issues, e.g., how to ensure project consistency in TA philosophy, model, methods and activities, provider qualifications and supervision, and quality control. This case study specifies how evaluators can serve as change agents by designing and promoting evaluation activities that offer effective means for internal organizational feedback and partner-to-partner coordination and accountability.

This paper concludes that, as a direct result of these evaluation efforts, a number of project improvements were made possible, including: increased appropriateness and depth of TA provision among TA providers; increased TA accountability; long term program development at the level of CBOs; knowledge generation among CBOs and TA providers; and systemic change at agency-level to incorporate portions of the evaluation instruments into their on-going work.

**Taking Formative Feedback Methods Seriously: Applications of Concept Mapping and Network Analysis Techniques in Evaluations of Comprehensive Community Initiatives**

---

**Honing the Model: The California Juvenile Crime Prevention Program Evaluation**

Demonstration Session 534 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG

**Chair**
Sally Brown, Philliber Research Associates

**Presenters**
Sally Brown, Philliber Research Associates
Tanja Heitman, Santa Barbara County Probation Department

**Abstract**
This session will describe the evolution and utility of the California JCPP Evaluation for model development and program strengthening. The evaluation was designed through a participatory process to capture the process and outcomes of this important statewide initiative. In the first stage, evaluation results were used to monitor whether the sites were targeting the appropriate clientele and implementing the theoretical model as planned. In the next stage, outcome results were used to identify successful strategies, which led to the sites actively learning from each other to strengthen their own programs. As these multi-system collaborative programs developed, the process evaluation sought to capture evidence of true change within and across
systems. A model that defines the developmental continuum of systems change emerged and will be presented. In its final stage, the JCPP Evaluation results were utilized effectively in a political process to refund and sustain the initiative.

The Workings of the Vermont Research Partnership: Looking Through the Lens of the Youth Initiated Grants Project

Demonstration Session 535 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Chair: Cheryl Mitchell, Agency of Human Services
Presenters: Susan B Hasazi, University of Vermont
Cheryl Mitchell, Agency of Human Services
Scott Johnson, Agency of Human Services
Jennifer L Jewiss, University of Vermont
Jennifer L. Jewiss, University of Vermont

Abstract: In 1998, the Vermont Legislature created the Vermont Research Partnership (VRP) to study and improve the effectiveness of the collaborative, community-based initiatives of the Agency of Human Services, the Department of Education, and the University of Vermont. The VRP develops a shared research agenda and pooled resources to commission and conduct evaluation projects. Presenters from state and local agencies, and the university, will share their experiences with the evaluation of the Youth Initiated Grants Project as a means of illuminating the workings of the VRP. The Youth Initiated Grants Project seeks to give youths a greater voice in their communities through the development of Youth councils, which serve as grantmakers for youth initiated projects. The benefits and challenges of this statewide research partnership will be considered. The presenters will discuss how evaluation is informed by this context, and how the evaluations inform these state, local, and academic systems.

Roundtables: Private Sector

Roundtables Session 536 to be held in the Tidewater room
Chair: To be announced

Table A: Assessing Organizational Barriers to Using Evaluation in Support of Learning in Foundations

Presenters: William E Bickel, University of Pittsburgh
Jennifer E Post, University of Pittsburgh
Ricardo Millett, The Woods Fund
Catherine Awsumb Nelson, Independent Consultant

Abstract: Philanthropic foundations are uniquely positioned to be "social experimenters" with the opportunity to deliberately structure their grantmaking to generate knowledge that has broad impact beyond immediate grants (Wisely, 1989; Porter and Kramer, 1999). Evaluation processes can play an important role in supporting this knowledge production. However, recent research (Bickel, Millett, Nelson, 2002) has identified substantial structural and cultural barriers in foundations that work against the use of evaluation to support learning. To improve one's organizational capacities to increase learning, these potential barriers must be identified and addressed. Using a "learning organization" framework, the presenters have developed a tool for assessing organizational conditions in foundations likely to influence the effective use of evaluation. The process and instrument are designed as a means to divine the evaluation barriers operating, and to provide direction for addressing these challenges, thereby building the learning capacity of the foundation in which they are employed.

Table B: Evaluation: The Engine in a Dynamic Learning Loop

Presenters: John Sherman, The Headwaters Group
Craig Russon, WK Kellogg Foundation

Abstract: Ricardo Millett, past director of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Evaluation Unit once stated, "The bane of evaluation is a poorly designed program". Despite such observations and the increasing use of logic modeling, evaluation in the foundation community too often remains relegated to an afterthought. Concurrently, foundations often consider evaluation as a judgment tool instead of a learning tool (for it and its grantees). The Headwaters Group Philanthropic Services (Headwaters) is working with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Food and Society Initiative (Kellogg) to address both of these issues. Together they are creating learning loops driven by cluster-level evaluation that foster an environment of learning for the foundations and grantees, inform improved grantmaking and grantee performance, and provide valuable information for measuring success.

Table C: Knowing when It's Time to Change Your Internal Evaluation Plan: A Case Study of the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE)
Presenter  | Nancy Rosenbaum, National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship  
Abstract  | What happens to your evaluation plan when your organization revises its mission statement and decides to go to scale? These are the questions that we are currently facing at the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE), a non-profit organization that uses entrepreneurship education to help low-income youth improve their academic, life, business, and technology skills. As our organization attempts to grow and reach more students, we have learned that the original evaluation tools we initially developed to measure impact are no longer viable. Also, conceptual changes in our mission statement have rendered aspects of our evaluation plan obsolete. This paper will address the steps that we have taken to modify our internal evaluation plan including: hiring a staff person to focus on evaluation, creating a Theory of Change model, and developing new ways of capturing information about program characteristics and variation. 

Table D: Resource Network: A Structure for Learning a Lot, Having Fun, and Staying Employed as an Independent Evaluator  
Presenters  | Cynthia R Roberts-Gray, Resource Network  
            | Mary Lou Bell, Bell Group  
            | Magdalena Rood, Evaluation & Applied Research  
Abstract  | Resource Network is a group of 8 to 12 independently employed scientists who pool their talents and specialties to put together exactly the right team for different projects. Some members of the network are retired from government work or are new mothers who have a passion for their science but want to work only intermitently or part-time. Others are committed full-time to independent work as applied scientists and program evaluators. In this presentation, 2 to 3 members of the network will present a vignette depicting how they got their start in independent practice, how they connected with the network, and how working together has helped them learn, have fun, and stay employed. With input from others at the table, the group will develop a list of principles for building and benefiting from resource networks for independent evaluation.

Table E: Client-driven Evaluation of Business Development Services  
Presenter  | Michael Taku, Global Academy for Development, Education and Research  
Abstract  | Ensuring that Business Development Services (BDS) be demand-driven and provided to the right Micro and Small Enterprise (MSE) client are two guiding principles of best practice in BDS delivery. Although these principles suggest that client-entered factors are likely to have an impact on the performance of BDS providers, little is known about a client-centered perspective of BDS evaluation. In this regard, two questions that have not been adequately addressed are: 1) what is a BDS client-driven evaluation? 2) To what extent does a client-driven evaluation enhance understanding regarding the performance of BDS providers? This workshop examines these questions and provides new directions for BDS evaluation. Theoretical and practical implications of client-driven evaluation are considered.

Table F: Evaluation of e-Learning and Learning Objects in a Distributed Setting  
Presenters  | Sharon Marie May, Compaq Computer Corporation  
            | Vanessa Moss-Summers, Xerox Corporation  
            | Trude Fawson, Training Impact Group Inc  
Abstract  | With the increased use of web based learning in organizations, there is a growing need to evaluate learning events, learning objects, and the utility of knowledge content in a web environment. Evaluators are challenged to provide information about utility, effectiveness, and behavior changes brought about by an intangible intervention on an unseen audience. What types of evaluands do we encounter in this environment? What methodologies can we apply to collect meaningful information about experiences in the virtual environment? What major obstacles do we face? How do time and distance play a factor?

Using Formal Needs Assessment Data in Ongoing Strategic Planning  
Paper Session 537 to be held in the Kennedy room  
Sponsored by the Needs Assessment TIG  
Chair  | Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University  
Discussants  | Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University  
            | Ryan Watkins, George Washington University  
            | Ingrid Guerra, University of Michigan at Dearborn  
Presenters  | M Sue Hamann, Coastal AHEC  
            | Helen Suarez DeCasper, SERVE  
            | Karla M Ewald, Association for Retarded Citizens of Greensboro  
Abstract  | The Association for Retarded Citizens of Greensboro (ARCG) is committed to securing for all people with mental retardation the
opportunity to choose and realize their goals of where and how they learn, live, work, and play. Its mission includes leadership and the development of necessary human and financial resources to attain its goals. Consistent with this mission and as part of its 2000-2005 strategic plan, the ARCG conducted a community wide needs assessment of services for children and adults with disabilities. Surveys and focus groups were the primary sources of data for the needs assessment. Findings from the needs assessment have been incorporated into the revised strategic plan.

The purpose of this paper is to present an analysis of the quality of the needs assessment, the findings of the needs assessment, and the utility of the findings to the ongoing strategic planning efforts of the agency. Moreover, the role of the external evaluators in conducting strategic planning sessions to incorporate the findings from the needs assessment will be discussed.

**Building Evaluation Use Theory and Research**

MultiPaper Session 538 to be held in the Jefferson room

Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG

Chair  
John M Owen, The University of Melbourne

**The User-orientated Evaluator's Role in Refining and Testing Program Theory: A Case Analysis**

Presenters  
Christina Ann Christie, University of California at Los Angeles  
Marvin C Alkin, University of California at Los Angeles

Abstract  
Program theory plays a prominent role in many evaluations and is not just a component of theory-driven evaluations. This paper presents a case study of refining and testing a program's theory in a user-orientated evaluation. In user-orientated (or utilization-focused) evaluations, primary users play a prominent role in defining their own program theory, but the evaluator may still perform the necessary actions in helping to refine program theory and ultimately test it, or portions of it. This case study concerns a university's academic outreach program to three local school districts. The program has as its objective increasing the number of UC eligible and UCLA admissible students from targeted schools. The authors worked with university faculty to help refine and test their outreach program theory. The evaluation procedures and findings will be presented.


Presenter  
Joy A Mordica, Georgia State University

**Assessing the State of Research-based Knowledge in Welfare Policy: Something New or Deja Vu?**

Presenters  
Staci T Lowe, Cornell University  
Charles McClintock, Fielding Graduate Institute

Abstract  
Federal government research RFPs on welfare policy provide an important perspective on the role of research-based knowledge in shaping public policy. In the first phase of this study we analyzed policy literature and RFP content to identify knowledge themes and gaps that have persisted over time (McClintock & Lowe, 2001). In phase two, we present an in-depth content analysis of twenty years of RFPs as well as interviews with key informants related to the sponsorship and use of welfare policy research. We use these findings to illustrate ways in which research questions have remained the same over time, as well as evolved to incorporate more complex awareness of policy and implementation issues. Implications are drawn about the strengths and weaknesses of mainstream policy research knowledge. McClintock, C. and Lowe, S. T. (2001). Welfare reform and its enduring questions: What have we learned from evaluation research? In G. Julnes and E. M. Foster (Eds.), Outcomes of Welfare Reform for Families Who Leave TANF. New Directions for Program Evaluation. No. 91: pp.9-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**When Local Systems Object: A Concurrent Validity Study Comparing A Qualitative and Quantitative Way to Assess Food (In)Security - Carried out Within and With the Means of an Extension Service Nutrition Education Program**

Demonstration Session 539 to be held in the Lincoln room

Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG

Chair  
C Gerlinde Struhkamp, University of Minnesota

Presenters  
C Gerlinde Struhkamp, University of Minnesota  
Elizabeth J Sandell, University of Minnesota

Abstract  
In this demonstration the presenters will show how they conducted a research project in an Extension-based Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP). In a collaborative evaluation process all management levels got involved in this "joint venture" aimed at carrying out a high-quality
A Model Evaluation Plan for Intervention in the Schools: The Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative

Panel Session 541 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair
   Oliver T Massey, University of South Florida
Session Abstract
The Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative is an ambitious attempt to address violence and safety in the schools through the provision of a broad array of prevention and intervention services. An outstanding feature of the grant is the mandatory set aside of a minimum of five percent of the budget for evaluation of grant activities. The program that emerged from this grant initiative incorporated fourteen separate service elements including prevention, intervention and educational services that were provided by the school district, community service agencies, the sheriff's department and the county health department. This two pronged presentation provides an analysis of the emergent evaluation model that was developed through a process of evaluability assessment and provides the result of major components of the evaluation. The emphasis in our 45 minute presentation is the emergent process of evaluation model building and collaborative evaluation in the schools. We will also highlight results of our three year research program.

The Emergent Evaluation Model: Collaborative Evaluation Building Through Evaluability Assessment

Presenters
   Oliver T Massey, University of South Florida
   Kathleen Armstrong, University of South Florida
   Michael Boroughs, University of South Florida

Abstract
The Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative brought together a wide range of school and community based partners for the provision of services aimed at youth violence and safety in the schools. The challenge to the evaluation team was to identify and develop a cogent plan that took into account the interests, experience and cooperation of school and community program teams given the resources and unique opportunities that existed in the school district. This presentation will describe the process of developing the evaluation model through a form of evaluability assessment. One of the most challenging task was to integrate evaluation activities into a coherent plan that could capture activities of the school district, demonstrate fulfillment of grant obligations, and document the effectiveness of individual programs. The three component model that emerged flows from more global to more specific understanding of school safety and violence and includes a contextual, a cohort, and a targeted evaluation.

Promising Outcomes: Evaluation Findings from the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative

Presenters
   Kathleen Armstrong, University of South Florida
   Oliver T Massey, University of South Florida
   Michael Boroughs, University of South Florida

Session Abstract
This paper will highlight the results from the evaluation of the Pinellas County School District Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative, with regard to a contextual, cohort, and targeted analysis. The contextual analysis concentrated on the school setting, the perceptions and experiences of students, staff, and families regarding school safety and violence, obtained through record reviews of master files over four years and surveys conducted for each of the three years of the grant. The cohort analysis was utilized to provide longitudinal data of students participating in grant funded programs who were paired with a matching cohort, and the targeted analysis provided pre and post comparisons of students completing selected interventions. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized in order to provide a more comprehensive and meaningful evaluation that could be used to enhance programs and generalize efforts to other communities.

Assessment of Large Scale Health Programs with Varying Levels of Intervention

Panel Session 542 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG
Chair
   Gail V Barrington, Barrington Research Group
Session Abstract
This session will provide an overview of the logistical and methodological challenges arising in the assessment of large-scale social programs; in this case, the evaluation of Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program (CPNP), a nationwide program providing prenatal care to high-risk women. The
fact that there was wide variability in service delivery between different program sites required imaginative solutions during the design of the data collection and reporting system. This service variability was problematic in terms of assessing program impact, but interestingly, also provided an opportunity: those women who received a low level of service were used as a convenient internal comparison population. A number of comparison groups, each with unique strengths and weaknesses, was used to build up a body of evidence regarding the effect of the CPNP of birth outcomes.

**Designing Variability into a Data Collection System**

**Presenter**  
Gail V Barrington, Barrington Research Group

**Abstract**  
Evaluation of large-scale social programs is always challenging, especially if the intervention can vary among locations and even between individual clients. This paper will discuss the design and implementation issues that arose during the evaluation of the Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program (CPNP), a national prenatal care initiative. Since each CPNP program site had its own service delivery model, tailored to the needs of the local population, a flexible, consultative and iterative evaluation system was established. The system required not only a data collection process taking into account the variability of local program sites, but also a reporting system which met different information needs at the local, regional, and national levels. After six years of implementation, individual case data on over 30,000 participants has been collected and annual program data is collected with a 90% compliance rate. A brief description will be provided about how the framework was established, how the tools were designed, and how the data is managed, analyzed and reported. Finally, some of the lessons learned in establishing and maintaining the data collection system will be advanced for consideration.

**Measuring Program Impact with Non-experimental Designs**

**Presenter**  
H Lindsay Guyn, Barrington Research Group

**Abstract**  
One of the challenges faced in the evaluation of social programs is the fact that it is often difficult to use an experimental design to assess program impact. Comparison populations that are not randomly assigned are subject to an assortment of experimental bias effects, which can cast doubt on the validity of the study results. This was the problem faced by evaluators of the Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program (CPNP), a nationwide program providing prenatal care to high-risk women. This paper discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the four comparison groups that were ultimately chosen for the evaluation. One of these comparison populations was created using an innovative method of assessing level of service for individual program participants. The use of a variety of comparison groups, each with unique strengths and weaknesses, allowed the evaluators to build up a convincing body of evidence regarding the CPNP effect on birth outcomes.

---

**Sharing Advances in Evaluating Peace Building and Conflict Resolution Interventions**

**Think Tank Session 543 to be held in the Prince William room**

**Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG**

**Facilitator**  
Antoinette B Brown, Eurasia Foundation

**Abstract**  
Peace building and conflict resolution interventions are being implemented in a number of contexts both in the U.S. and internationally. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of these interventions presents a challenge. There are few publications and even fewer manuals that can guide our efforts in this area. The purpose of this think tank is to provide an opportunity for evaluators to share their experiences in evaluating peace building and conflict resolution efforts. After a brief orientation to the topic the attendees will break into small groups to explore various aspects of the topic. Depending on the number of attendees there will be four to six small groups of ten to twelve individuals. Among the possible small groups are the following: conflict resolution in U.S. school settings; international conflict resolution; preventive diplomacy; peace building; participatory methodology in peace building; and peacebuilding interventions with youth.
Evaluating Collaborative Approaches to Systems Change

Panel Session 545 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand
Chair: Heather Barton-Villagrana, Illinois Center for Violence Prevention
Discussant: Heather Barton-Villagrana, Illinois Center for Violence Prevention

Session Abstract: This panel presents two methods for evaluating collaborative approaches to systems change. The first method is based on the experiences of the Baltimore Family Support Strategy, a community-based initiative for improving the health of families with young children that utilizes collaboratives in seven neighborhoods. The Baltimore evaluators employ neighborhood functioning assessments, direct observations, and interviews with collaborative chairpersons to assess the collaboratives' effectiveness. The second evaluation method is based on the experiences of the Violence Prevention Collaborative (VPC) in Rockford, IL. The VPC is a coalition representing multiple local agencies that works to change the way violence is addressed and prevented by various major systems in Rockford. The Rockford evaluators employ a retrospective case study and a monitoring system to assess the VPC's impact on systems change. This panel argues that evaluating the work of collaboratives is best accomplished using a multi-method approach that is sensitive to local needs.

Neighborhood Collaboratives Working to Enhance Service Coordination: Lessons from Baltimore's Family Support Strategy Evaluation

Presenter: Darius Tandon, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
Abstract: Baltimore's Family Support Strategy is a community-based initiative to improve health and well being of families with children 0-6 in seven neighborhoods. A key initiative component is the development of neighborhood collaboratives to govern and facilitate family support strategy planning and implementation. In particular, collaboratives are the conduit for promoting systems changes, in the form of enhanced service coordination. This presentation discusses efforts to evaluate collaboratives' effectiveness in facilitating systems changes. Three data sources provide information on these efforts: 1. Network Functioning Assessments with members of neighborhood collaboratives elicit their perceptions of collaborative efforts to promote various types of service coordination across service providers. 2. Direct Observations of monthly Collaborative Meetings by evaluation staff using a structured observation protocol, provide data on Collaborative discussions and actions related to systems changes. 3. Semi-structured Interviews with Collaborative Chairpersons provide in-depth perspectives on critical events and processes facilitating Collaboratives' efforts to promote systems changes.

A Collaborative's Efforts to Change Systemic Responses to Family Violence: Lessons from Evaluating the Rockford Violence Prevention Collaborative

Presenters: Michael Fagen, University of Illinois at Chicago; Heather Barton-Villagrana, Illinois Center for Violence Prevention
Abstract: Since 1995, the Violence Prevention Collaborative (VPC) in Rockford, IL has worked to improve the responsiveness of the healthcare and law enforcement systems to victims of family violence. The VPC is a 17-member coalition representing social service agencies, healthcare providers, law enforcement, and public health officials. Together these organizations have worked to highlight the importance of preventing family violence locally; provided training to healthcare and law enforcement professionals on family violence issues; and encouraged coordination between relevant local agencies on these issues. This presentation discusses an evaluation to assess the impact of VPC's collaborative activities on systems-level change. Two methods were used to evaluate the program: 1. A retrospective case study examining the impact of VPC's collaborative activities on systems-level change. Two methods were used to evaluate the program: 1. A retrospective case study examining the impact of VPC's collaborative activities on both the healthcare and law enforcement systems, and 2. A monitoring system used to track ongoing coalition activities and any corresponding community-level changes relevant to the mission of the VPC.
discuss settings where the value of logic modeling is captured with outcome charts alone and instances in which logic modeling has been used to define program strategy and facilitate program improvement. They will use examples from their own experiences with federal, state, and community organizations to illustrate settings where logic models work best, and where outcome charts can be a better option. The panel chair will discuss both presentations, offer additional insights, and invite comments and questions from members of the audience.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**Using Program Theory to Design Evaluations: Challenges and Dilemmas**
Expert Lecture Session 546 to be held in Ballroom B  
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG  
Speaker  
Stewart I Donaldson, Claremont Graduate University  
Abstract  
Despite the burgeoning literature explicating the benefits of theory-driven program development and evaluation, there remains a strong need for practical advice, written insights and experiences, and examples from evaluation practice illustrating how to implement this approach. The purpose of this expert lecture is to help evaluators develop a concrete understanding of the strengths, limitations, challenges, and dilemmas of using program theory to design evaluations in modern human service organizations. This will be accomplished by briefly describing the theory-driven evaluation process, presenting and critiquing a wide range of program theories, and by examining lessons learned from using program theory to design evaluations across a variety of settings and programs.

**Using a Systems Science Approach to Understand and Impact Conflict and Coordination Between Child Welfare, Substance Abuse Treatment, and Judicial Systems**
Panel Session 548 to be held in Ballroom D  
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG  
Chair  
Beth L Green, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc  
Session Abstract  
Evaluators are increasingly challenged to develop techniques that are appropriate to evaluate human service systems, rather than individual programs. The proposed panel describes how principles from the field of systems science relate to evaluation techniques, and are useful in evaluating and influencing complex systems. Using examples from a current study focused on how child welfare, substance abuse treatment, and legal systems are responding to changes in federal child welfare policy, we will describe how we integrated qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection and analysis to better understand these complex systems, and how this approach has allowed us to identify leverage points for systems change. Evaluators will hear specific examples of how findings from quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study have allowed us to paint a comprehensive, detailed and nuanced picture of how the systems are working (or not working), and the challenges to adequately depicting complex systems dynamics.

**Benefits of Applying Systems Science to the Evaluation of Complex Service Systems**
Presenters  
Beth L Green, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc  
Anna Rockhill, Portland State University  
Abstract  
The first paper will outline an ongoing study of how child welfare, substance abuse treatment, and legal systems are working with families given new federal policy designed to reduce children’s length of stay in foster care. To understand how these systems have responded to the needs of these families, we are conducting a multi-method evaluation informed by a systems science approach to research. A systems science approach involves viewing the object of study as a complex, dynamic, and inter-related set of people and processes. Systems science techniques involve many concepts that evaluators are quite familiar with: the use of multiple perspectives as a way of knowing, application of multiple methods for understanding complex problems, and the use of feedback loops and leverage points to influence the behavior of systems. The first paper will describe these concepts and the benefits of adopting this perspective for understanding complex, dynamic, human service systems.

**Creative Approaches to Design and Analysis of a Mixed Method Study of Human Service Systems**
Presenters  
Anna Rockhill, Portland State University  
Beth L Green, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc  
Abstract  
The second paper will describe specific research design and analysis strategies that we have used that have benefited from taking a systems science approach. The study involves three complementary research components: (1) an administrative data study; (2) a series of qualitative key stakeholder interviews; and (3) longitudinal family case studies. Through both design (e.g., utilizing parallel data collection forms) and analysis, the goal of the project frames evaluation as a dynamic process in which findings and questions from each component inform the ongoing process of data collection and
Web-based Versus Traditional Survey Administration: Using Empirical Evidence to Choose Delivery Modality

MultiPaper Session 549 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG
Chair: Marcia J Bober, San Diego State University

The Efficiency and Effectiveness of Web-based Surveys to Collect Data from K-12 Teachers
Presenter: Patricia A Muller, Indiana University
Abstract: This paper discusses the efficiency and effectiveness of web-based surveys to collect evaluation data from K-12 teachers. Using data collected as part of an evaluation, this paper compares results collected via a self-administered written survey and results collected via a web-based version of the same survey. Teachers were randomly assigned to either the written or web-based survey administration, allowing us to use the results to examine issues regarding the feasibility, validity and reliability of web-based surveys as a data collection method. For example, this paper addresses issues such as technical issues (screen configurations, tiled versus full-screen displays) that may affect the validity of responses; and concerns regarding the adequacy of coverage (i.e. persons having a computer and/or e-mail addresses).

Personal Computer or Pencil: Paper-and-Pencil Versus Web-based Survey Responses in Evaluation
Presenter: Tracy D Shaw, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Abstract: This paper discusses the efficiency and effectiveness of web-based surveys to collect evaluation data from K-12 teachers. Using data collected as part of an evaluation, this paper compares results collected via a self-administered written survey and results collected via a web-based version of the same survey. Teachers were randomly assigned to either the written or web-based survey administration, allowing us to use the results to examine issues regarding the feasibility, validity and reliability of web-based surveys as a data collection method. For example, this paper addresses issues such as technical issues (screen configurations, tiled versus full-screen displays) that may affect the validity of responses; and concerns regarding the adequacy of coverage (i.e. persons having a computer and/or e-mail addresses).

Action Science Approaches to Evaluation: A Comparison of Organizational Learning in Schools in the United States and Israel
Panel Session 550 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair: Daniel V Folkman, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Discussant: Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Session Abstract: Improving public education and helping children who are most at risk academically is a major challenge facing contemporary society. Current research documents that successful efforts at school reform have created professional learning organizations that are inclusive of teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and community partners. Evaluation practitioners are in a unique position to help schools create and sustain a learning organization. This panel discussion will explore two approaches to school reform from an evaluation perspective that are currently being implemented by the presenters one in the United States and the other in Israel. An action science approach is taken by both panelists to explore the espoused theories and theories-in-use that contribute to a) teaching and learning practice in the classroom, b) creating a culture of learning and experimentation within the school, and c) sustaining progress in helping all children achieve academically.

Action Science Approaches to Evaluation and Organizational Learning: Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Presenter: Daniel V Folkman, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Abstract: The Milwaukee case study provides an example of how an evaluation practitioner applies action science theory and methods of inquiry in helping schools become learning organizations. The strategy is based on facilitating participatory action research (PAR) teams among teachers, school administrators, parents and community stakeholders. As a self-assessment strategy, the PAR teams a) frame the problem, b) design and implement an intervention, c) track and evaluate results, d) dialogue and reflect on what is being learned, and e) initiate follow-up strategies. The PAR process is a vehicle to develop leadership among school administrators, to create a pool of PAR facilitators throughout the school community, and to promote a culture of inquiry and experimentation which is at the core of a learning organization. The Milwaukee example will include an action science map of the Model 1 theory-in-use that inhibits learning and collaborative problem solving within the school environment. It will also include a comprehensive intervention strategy aimed at...
creating a community of practice among stakeholders that is capable of producing tangible gains in student learning.

The New Education Environment: A Four Faceted *Theory* for Helping Schools More Effectively Serve Students-at-risk

**Presenter** Victor J Friedman, Ruppin Institute

**Abstract** This paper describes the *theory-in-use* of the New Education Environment (NEE), a program aimed at helping schools work more effectively with *students at risk* in Israel. Through tracking systems, Israeli educational system systematically distinguishes between students perceived as having more, or less, potential for success. Particularly when schools are evaluated according to student achievement, there is a strong tendency to invest the most resources and the best teachers on high potential students. As a result, students perceived as having the least potential, particularly those with low socio-economic-cultural status, are grouped in particular classes or schools. Because these frameworks lack any approach to providing these students with a meaningful education, they become breeding grounds for frustration, anger, despair, and violence among students and teachers alike. The NEE program has evolved over 15 years of experimentation and development to meet the needs of this population. The NEE's "espoused theory" calls for the development of physical, technological, and human environments that enable teachers to diagnose the needs of each individual student and to develop learning plans accordingly. The NEE places a strong emphasis on developing a team within the school and involving teachers in determining their students' needs and designing the environment. The NEE's "theory-in-use," however, has been shaped by the program professionals and the school personnel who have implemented it over time. This theory-in-use focuses on four kinds of knowledge: (1) an understanding of the difficulties faced by the target population broadly as both underachieving students and the educational frameworks that serve them, (2) a new way of thinking about the system-teacher-student relationship as a basis for more effective action, (3) a set of "actionable" teaching techniques for helping students learn more effectively, and (4) a process for introducing these three kinds of knowledge into the school, adapting them, and integrating them into school practice.

Developing Assessment Systems that Meet NCATE Standards

**Demonstration Session 551 to be held in the Potomac I room**

**Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG**

**Facilitators** Kathleen Sullivan, University of Mississippi

James V Sullivan, University of Mississippi

**Abstract** Higher education accreditation agencies recently have shifted their focus away from processes and toward program outcomes, such as students' and graduates' effectiveness as professional service providers. Regardless of the nature of the higher education program to be accredited, evaluators are uniquely prepared to assist program faculty in designing formative evaluation systems that measure the worth or merit of academic programs in colleges and universities. This session describes a step-by-step process for helping teacher education faculty build an assessment system that meets or exceeds NCATE accreditation standards.

Evaluating Mental Health Programs for Hard-to-serve Populations

**MultiPaper Session 552 to be held in the Potomac II room**

**Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG**

**Chair** Christopher R Larrison, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**How Effective are Transitional Residential Facilities for Mentally Ill Offenders Released from a State Hospital or Prison**

**Presenter** Andridia V Mapson, Gateways Satellite

**Abstract** The purpose of this presentation is to examine the effect of transitional residential facilities on the bio/psycho/social adjustment of mentally ill offenders. The sample consists of twenty mentally ill men and women recently released from a state hospital or prison and who currently reside in a residential transitional facility in Los Angeles, California. Data were collected using face-to-face interviews over a period of six months. The interview assessed the participant's bio-psycho-social adjustment. This presentation discusses how intensive mental health treatment and supervision can help to rehabilitate clients and enhance their competent functioning within society.

**Skyland Trail's Operation Prevention: A Program Evaluation for Dually Diagnosed Consumers**

**Presenter** Tara G Arnold, Skyland Trail

**Abstract** This exploratory pre-experimental quantitative research study examines the effectiveness of an innovative dual diagnosis treatment program in Atlanta, GA. As a result of the co-occurring conditions, clients often have special needs in treatment due to cognitive deficits. Traditional substance abuse treatment can be too confrontive, while mental health treatment typically minimizes the impact of substance use. In response to the literature on dual diagnosis, a program was created to treat both disorders simultaneously by the same staff to avoid duplication of services or ignorance of the coexisting...
conditions. The program is designed to prevent substance abuse and psychiatric re-hospitalization, relapse, and enhance performance on measurement indexes. New treatment approaches, policies, and social work skills are suggested to work effectively with dual diagnosis.

The Ecomap: A Tool for Evaluating Collaborations
Skill-building Workshop Session 553 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG
Facilitator Wendy L Tackett, Battle Creek Public Schools
Abstract Participants will learn to use a tool called an Ecomap (this tool was developed in the realm of social work yet has suitable application to evaluation use). An Ecomap is a visual tool that depicts all key stakeholders involved in a program/project/organization from four perspectives: those stakeholders that monitor the program; those stakeholders that push the program forward; those stakeholders that support the program; and those stakeholders that benefit from the program. Beyond being an organizational tool, the Ecomap also allows the organization to illustrate the level of communication occurring with all key stakeholders. This tool is essential to strategic planning and can be used as an evaluative tool at regular follow-up intervals. It is especially useful to organizations that have a goal of improving or increasing collaboration.

Advancing Dialogue Around Culturally Responsive Evaluation: Toward Systemic Impact
Expert Lecture Session 554 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair Rodney K Hopson, Duquesne University
Discussants Gerunda B Hughes, Howard University
Denice Ward Hood, Northern Arizona University
Speakers Henry T Frierson, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Stafford Hood, Arizona State University
Abstract The importance of understanding culturally relevant and response approaches to evaluation extends beyond increasing the numbers of evaluators who are competent to effectively work across and within racially and ethnically diverse populations. Examining cultural context and meaning in evaluation contributes to different kinds of understandings about what evaluation is and what it can be, potentially reforming and rethinking dominant beliefs about how social programs affect diverse peoples and groups. The purpose of this expert lecture is to feature two senior evaluation colleagues, Henry Frierson, Professor in the School of Education, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Stafford Hood, Associate Professor in the College of Education, Arizona State University. Their lecture will highlight their combined work, its wider implications, and reflections on the need for paying closer attention to the role of culturally responsive evaluation at all phases of the evaluation process.

How Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluation Efforts Leads to System Reform
Panel Session 555 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair Geraldine Y French, US Department of Agriculture
Discussants Linda Blanton, Partnership for Children of Cumberland County
Jane Roth, US Department of Agriculture
Session Abstract The purpose of this panel is to show how the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process brings about program and system changes. The presenters will discuss the strategies they used to involve stakeholders in planning and conducting the evaluation. We will show through specific examples some of the barriers to effective stakeholder involvement and strategies for overcoming these obstacles in order to encourage information exchange. The panel will address how stakeholder participation in the evaluation process builds trust, maximizes resources and efficiency, and can foster better and more innovative solutions and improvements to systems.

The Impact of Stakeholder Groups on Improving USDA’s Recall Program
Presenter Geraldine Y French, US Department of Agriculture
Abstract USDA’s Recall Program was developed to ensure public safety by removing adulterated meat, poultry, or egg products from commerce. Stakeholder involvement in the evaluation of this program was essential to ensure they clearly understood how the recall program worked and to provide feedback regarding their concerns. Because of this program’s public health implications, it has attracted much attention from multiple stakeholders. These
stakeholders had competing interests and perspectives on the objectives of the recall program and the desired outcomes. The data collection methods we used to obtain stakeholder feedback varied because of geographic proximity and regulatory constraints. We used the results from these several different methods to validate our findings. The strategies we used to involve stakeholder groups in the evaluation process led to many improvements in the recall program. This presentation will highlight these strategies and how they were used to improve this public health program.

Improving Child Care Subsidy, Coordination, and Referral

Presenter: Lena Klumper, The Partnership for Children of Cumberland County

Abstract: A Unified Child Care Subsidy Project was implemented by The Partnership for Children to coordinate and create efficiencies regarding child care subsidies. Efforts in 1997 were fragmented, resulting in over $1 million being returned to the state, rather than going to families trying to come off of welfare roles. Data used from national, state and country studies were used to begin planning for a more unified and efficient way of utilizing funds, with ultimate outcomes of more families receiving child care subsidies and becoming self-sufficient by either working and or attending college. Stakeholders in the community were utilized in creating a unified referral data management system that is shared among the seven agencies responsible for providing child care subsidies to the community. Data is compiled in a central repository for tracking, coordination, outcomes management and future planning. This has provided for a coordinated and solid referral system with a complete picture of resources used in the community, resulting in additional monies provided by the state to serve more families.

School and After School Cross-site Evaluations

MultiPaper Session 556 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG

After-school Program Evaluations: A Meta-analysis of Methodologies and Findings

Presenters: Errin M McComb, SERVE
          Catherine Scott-Little, SERVE

Abstract: After-school programs have become an important strategy for improving student learning. The need for sound evaluations to document program impacts has increased tremendously. Findings from a meta-analysis of after-school evaluations will be presented. Strategies for designing and conducting utilization-focused evaluations will be discussed.

The Ohio Jennings Initiative: The Challenges of Evaluating a Statewide Multi-year, Multi-site Educational Reform Project

Presenters: Jerry Bean, Independent Consultant
          Janice E Noga, University of Cincinnati
          Debbie Zorn, University of Cincinnati

Abstract: The objective of the Jennings Initiative is to support the implementation of academic content standards in ten districts across Ohio. The three-year goal is to impact systemic change in four key functional areas focused on supporting the successful implementation of standards-based educational practices: (a) collaborative leadership, (b) community partnerships, (c) parent engagement, and (d) alignment of instructional practices with standards. The Ohio Learning First Alliance (OLFA), a collaborative partnership of state-level educational organizations, and the Ohio Department of Education will support ten partnership districts in the planning and implementation of standards-based education. This presentation will focus on the challenges faced during Year 1 with respect to designing a multi-site, multi-level evaluation strategy focusing on implementation effectiveness at the district level and on describing systemic changes occurring across districts as a result of the development and use of collaborative leadership structures at both the state and district levels.

Environmental Education Evaluation: Working with Clients - Results from the Field

MultiPaper Session 557 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the Environmental Program Evaluation TIG

Chair: Michael R Mason, US Environmental Protection Agency

The Impact of Environmental Education on Sixth Grade Students' Science Achievement

Presenter: Katherine G Clavijo, Maryland Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education

Abstract: This study investigated the relationship between student involvement in environmental education (EE) and science achievement. The performance of students engaged in fifth and sixth grade classrooms identified as incorporating environmental education into science instruction was compared to that of students from similar classrooms that use traditional science instruction. Data from 4655 sixth grade students were analyzed using hierarchical multiple regression model to determine if environmental education improves prediction
of science achievement beyond that afforded by differences in socioeconomic status and previous science achievement. The results indicated that environmental education, when integrated into science instruction, does not improve prediction of CTBS science scores beyond that afforded by differences in previous achievement in science and socioeconomic status. This study has implications for researchers interested in examining the impact of environmental education on science achievement, as it provides evidence for the importance of including background characteristics, such as socioeconomic status and previous achievement, in research models. This study provides an example of how to use existing test score data to explore the relationship between environmental education and student achievement.

Changing the Client's Mind: Collaboratively Discovering What the Client Really Wants to Know

Presenter Joe Heimlich, The Ohio State University

Abstract Project WILD wanted a study of impact on student learning. Although a pilot study was conducted and data obtained, the findings were not as dramatic as the state coordinators for Project WILD expected. In the process of working with the coordinators to understand the data, the needs of the coordinators (evidence to justify the program to agency Directors) increasingly became clarified. It became obvious that two major errors in thinking were occurring in the evaluation design: 1) the primary audience of the program is not the student, but is the educator/teacher; and 2) the real information needed is the satisfaction of the program with those who implement the program, i.e., their perceptions of the value in and intentions to use the program in the future. This paper will discuss the role of the evaluator in prodding, guiding, and leading the client to reframing their evaluation questions to obtain better data.

Roundtables: Health & Human Services II

Roundtables Session 558 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair To be announced

Table A: Evaluating a Public-private Collaboration: Sharing Insights on Measurement Challenges

Presenters Ruth A Mohr, Michigan Public Health Institute
Nancy McCrohan, Michigan Public Health Institute

Abstract Development of collaboration between public and private agencies is an underlying assumption of the Michigan Cancer Consortium’s Initiative to improve cancer control. Assessment of collaboration development from multiple stakeholder viewpoints (e.g., Executive Committee, membership, ad hoc committee participants) via surveys and interviews occurs at key points in the Consortium’s lifecycle, e.g., post objective development (1998), post action planning (1999) and post each implementation year (2001 and ongoing). Qualitative and quantitative methodologies are used. Feedback from the assessments is provided to members and staff for use in ongoing planning. As we move into the Consortium’s adolescence, we are wrestling with new evaluation questions. The presentation on collaboration development to date will be used as a jumping off point for discussion on evaluating value-addedness of participation for individual member organizations and synergy overall. Participants will be invited to think with us about these challenges.

Table B: Using Stufflebeam’s Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Approach to Guide Self-study Accreditation Processes

Presenter Laurie A Clayton, University of Rochester

Abstract Accreditation measures institutional effectiveness and assesses educational programs to determine if they meet established standards and professional expectations. Evaluation remains an important ingredient in accreditation processes, measuring the adequacy with which programs achieve their intended objectives. Uniting accreditation and assessment processes with an evaluation model enhances its value and the ability to influence decisions. To demonstrate this hypothesis, the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry’s Office of Continuing Professional Education utilized Stufflebeam’s CIPP Evaluation Model to guide its Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education self-study process for reaccreditation. The Office of Continuing Professional Education, accredited through ACCME, develops and implements quality education programs for physicians and the health care communities they serve. This roundtable presentation will review Stufflebeam’s CIPP Evaluation Approach and accreditation in context with ACCME Essential Elements to evaluate the Office of Continuing Professional Education, program effectiveness and its ability to implement quality improvement processes.

Table C: Measuring Depressive Symptomatology: An Empirical Investigation of the Psychometric Properties of the Shortened CES-D

Presenters Stephen A Sivo, University of Central Florida
Lea Witta, University of Central Florida

Abstract Radloff (1977) developed a measure (the CES-D depression symptoms index) to assess the level of depressive symptomatology in a person, which has been used in research on healthy, physically ill, and mentally ill populations. A shortened version was later created because of the time required for its completion. Although the psychometrics of the shortened version in question has been investigated, most studies based their appraisals of the instrument on samples comprised of fewer than 200 respondents. This study proposes to scrutinize the psychometric properties of the instrument in a more rigorous manner than formerly used with a much larger population taken from the University of Michigan study, formerly known as the Asset and Health Dynamics among the Oldest Old (AHEAD).
Table D: Learning from a Regional Case Study to Improve Strategic Grantmaking Around Access to Health Care Issues

| Presenters                  | Rhonda M Ortiz, The California Endowment  
|                            | Pauline E Brooks, The California Endowment  
|                            | Astrid Hendricks-Smith, The California Endowment  

Abstract

The issue of access to health care in the United States is a conundrum with many dimensions. Oftentimes, foundation funds for health care access come into underserved communities in an uneven, uncoordinated, fashion. The result is overlapping services, an abundance and/or absence of other health care access services. Funders often do not invest the time and resources to fully coordinate their funding efforts with others doing similar work. Some large funders even experience problems with internally coordinating their own multiple programs directed to the same community. On the community side of this equation, too, there are few processes in place for coordinating and sharing funds across agencies to provide services. The purpose of this roundtable is to discuss a regional case study conducted by a major health care foundation to determine the extent to which efforts could be better coordinated.

Table E: Reforming the Continuum of Care Through the Evaluation Process

| Presenters                    | Jennifer W Campbell, Albert Einstein Healthcare Network  
|                              | James Burdine, Pennsylvania Department of Aging  
|                              | Sharon Spring, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare  
|                              | Chris Minnick, Albert Einstein Healthcare Network  
|                              | Pearl Graub, Philadelphia Corporation for Aging  
|                              | Harold Keister, Independent Consultant  

Abstract

The issue of access to health care in the United States is a conundrum with many dimensions. Oftentimes, foundation funds for health care access come into underserved communities in an uneven, uncoordinated, fashion. The result is overlapping services, an abundance and/or absence of other health care access services. Funders often do not invest the time and resources to fully coordinate their funding efforts with others doing similar work. Some large funders even experience problems with internally coordinating their own multiple programs directed to the same community. On the community side of this equation, too, there are few processes in place for coordinating and sharing funds across agencies to provide services. The purpose of this roundtable is to discuss a regional case study conducted by a major health care foundation to determine the extent to which efforts could be better coordinated.

Table F: Using Evaluation Data to Help a Project Move from Pilot to Sustainable Entity

| Presenter                     | Maura Harrington, Lodestar Management/Research Inc  

Abstract

The issue of access to health care in the United States is a conundrum with many dimensions. Oftentimes, foundation funds for health care access come into underserved communities in an uneven, uncoordinated, fashion. The result is overlapping services, an abundance and/or absence of other health care access services. Funders often do not invest the time and resources to fully coordinate their funding efforts with others doing similar work. Some large funders even experience problems with internally coordinating their own multiple programs directed to the same community. On the community side of this equation, too, there are few processes in place for coordinating and sharing funds across agencies to provide services. The purpose of this roundtable is to discuss a regional case study conducted by a major health care foundation to determine the extent to which efforts could be better coordinated.

Foundation Effectiveness: Exploring the Systemic Relationship Between Grantmaking Practice and Grantee Results

Panel Session 559 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair: Joel J Orosz, Grand Valley State University
Discussant: Douglas V Easterling, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Session Abstract: This session invites participants to explore the emergence of a stronger symbiotic relationship between evaluation and the field of philanthropy. The urgency with which many foundations are pressed to address the issue of accountability (i.e., demonstrate outcomes and impact) has increased interest in the relationship between grantmaking practice and sustainable social return on philanthropic investment. These panelists distill recent work on a W.K. Kellogg Foundation knowledge management initiative in which they: (1) share the results of a recently commissioned environmental scan that maps the current landscape of progressive philanthropic thinking, research, and evaluation relative to foundation effectiveness; (2) encourage session participants to consider the profound implications of the systemic context on the mutual adaptation among evaluators, grantmakers, and grantees as organizational learning partners, and (3) engage session participants in continuing the conversation to frame evaluation as a catalyst for field building around
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this exciting but challenging new agenda.

**Mapping the Landscape of Foundation Effectiveness**

*Presenters*
- Lisa Wyatt Knowlton, phillips wyatt knowlton
- Cynthia C Phillips, phillips wyatt knowlton
- Joel J Orosz, Grand Valley State University
- Tom Reis, WK Kellogg Foundation

*Abstract*

This paper presents an overview and introduction to the topic of foundation effectiveness from the perspective of strategic planning and organizational development. 37 interviews with leading experts and representatives of academic centers, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and individuals associated with and in philanthropy occurred in efforts to profile contemporary (recent and on-going) applied research/evaluation in foundation effectiveness. The term, “foundation effectiveness” was not predetermined and was defined by the participants themselves to include a broad continuum of factors and perspectives. The logic model or conceptual framework developed from the results of the scan, in brief; provide a snapshot of the systemic relationships uncovered, what’s happening across the field of philanthropy relative to foundation effectiveness, by whom, its status, related publications and primary sponsoring foundations.

**The Systemic Implications of Exploring Foundation Effectiveness**

*Presenters*
- Cynthia C Phillips, phillips wyatt knowlton
- Lisa Wyatt Knowlton, phillips wyatt knowlton
- Joel J Orosz, Grand Valley State University
- Tom Reis, WK Kellogg Foundation

*Abstract*

This paper explores the systemic context in which evaluation and philanthropy often intersect. The author identifies some of the implications inferred by the emphases and gaps across studies underway in pressing forward with framing a coherent foundation effectiveness agenda. In addition, insight is shared on the historical and cultural reasons why this topic has simultaneously captured the attention and imagination of the philanthropic community yet also raised interesting systemic challenges relative to evaluation and measurement.

**Bridging from Project Case Study to Portfolio Analysis**

*Expert Lecture Session 560 to be held in the Jefferson room*

*Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Eval TIG*

*Speaker*
- Rosalie T Ruegg, TIA Consulting

*Abstract*

This talk describes a new multi-step assessment approach, centered on the case study method, but providing portfolio assessment. The approach advances the descriptive case study method from providing an anecdotal account of a single project to providing an effective portrayal of the performance of an entire portfolio of projects. The approach rests on identification of a uniform set of output and outcome measures chosen to indicate progress towards longer run mission goals. It culminates in portfolio statistical measures and a composite performance rating system that cuts through an abundance of detail to serve as a powerful communication tool. The resulting measures describe the portfolio in terms that matter most to program stakeholders.

**Using the Targeting Outcomes of Programs (TOP) Model to Develop a Planning, Reporting and Evaluation System**

*Demonstration Session 561 to be held in the Lincoln room*

*Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG*

*Chair*
- Robert F Richard, Louisiana State University

*Presenters*
- Robert F Richard, Louisiana State University
- Satish Verma, Louisiana State University
- Robert F Richard, Louisiana State University

*Abstract*

The Targeting Outcomes of Programs (TOP) Model, developed by Bennett and Rockwell (1995) is a useful tool for Extension faculty to plan and evaluate educational programs. The Personnel and Organization Development Unit of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service (LCES) used the TOP model as a guide to develop a web based Extension planning and reporting system (EPARS) for use by Extension faculty beginning in 2000. An evaluation component is being phased into EPARS to hopefully create a culture within LCES that values program evaluation and sees its place in day-to-day educational efforts. The presenters will demonstrate to attendees how individual Extension faculty use the TOP model to guide them through the development
Assessing the Capacity of Governments to Build Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: A Diagnostic Approach

Demonstration Session 562 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Facilitators  Ray C Rist, The World Bank
           Jody Zall Kusek, The World Bank
Abstract  Governments throughout the world are under increasing pressure to demonstrate to their citizens that they are able to produce effective outcomes and impacts with public resources. Being able to provide such evidence on outcomes and impacts necessitates the creation of a viable monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. But countries are at different stages of capacity and political will to build M&E systems. This demonstration will address a diagnostic tool developed in the World Bank to assess the readiness of governments to undertake such an effort. The tool is applicable to both developing and developed countries—and to different levels of government. Examples of applications will be discussed as well as the methodology of undertaking the diagnostic. A copy of the diagnostic and several country reports based on its use will be provided to all participants.

Climate Monitoring: A Potential Catalyst for Systemic Change

Demonstration Session 563 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Facilitators  Joyce A Wolfe, Fort Hays State University
           Stephen N Kitzis, Fort Hays State University
Abstract  A key issue for program evaluators is the development and use of appropriate evaluation strategies that provide stakeholders adequate information for program assessment and modification. A dynamic transformation of a project can occur when evaluation strategies provide a high degree of utility and incisiveness, acting as the catalyst for systemic change. The evaluation of RURAL has resulted in the development of several techniques that are poised to elicit such a transformation. The RURAL project in Hays, Kansas was one of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students violence prevention/early childhood development grants funded by the federal government. This demonstration will focus upon multi-level analyses of school and community climate survey data, strengths and weaknesses of the survey instruments, as well as the potential systemic impact of the evaluation. There will also be some discussion of the importance of data collection systems for the sustainability of valuable project components.

Measuring the Difference: Development and Application of the National Network of Libraries of Medicine Planning and Evaluation Guide for Health Information Outreach Programs

Panel Session 564 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG
Chair  Cynthia A Olney, University of Texas at San Antonio
Session Abstract  In September 2000, the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Network of Libraries of Medicine, Pacific Northwest Region, published a guide for health science libraries to evaluate outreach programs to atypical users of health information services (such as social services agencies and community organizations). The guide's objective was to assist holders of the agencies' grants and contracts in conducting high quality evaluation of their outreach programs. The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio Library, recipients of the first NLM community outreach contract since publication of the guide, agreed to field-test it and provide feedback. This panel will describe the guide's development and results of the field test. The presentation will interest foundation leaders looking for methods to train their grant-holders, while agency staff may find ideas for applying written evaluation guides to their own planning and evaluation process. The guide is available at www.nnlm.gov/evaluation.

Measuring the Difference: Developing the National Network of Libraries of Medicine's Resource Guide for Evaluating a Community Outreach Program

Presenter  Catherine M Burroughs, National Network of Libraries of Medicine
Abstract  As standards for measuring the impact of community outreach projects rose over the years, foundations and granting agencies became aware of the lack of training and skill among their grant-holders in evaluation methods. In 1997, the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Network of Libraries, Pacific Northwest Region, addressed the training gap by developing a guide for health science libraries to plan and evaluate outreach programs to atypical users of health information services (such as social services agencies, community organizations and churches). Guide author Catherine
Burroughs will discuss the process of developing the guide, which involved an advisory group of 18 national experts in evaluation. She also will discuss the areas of the guide she feels could be modified after observing its use by NLM contract holders.

**Application of the National Network of Libraries of Medicine's Guide for Evaluating a Community Outreach Program**

Presenters: Cynthis A Olney, University of Texas at San Antonio  
Debra G Warner, University of Texas at San Antonio  
Virginia M Bowden, University of Texas at San Antonio  
Evelyn R Olivier, University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract: The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio Library received the first NLM community outreach contract since publication of the outreach resource guide. The contract was funded to develop efforts in the rural, medically underserved Lower Rio Grande Valley to increase residents' awareness of and skills in accessing NLM consumer health information on the Internet. To date, the outreach team has used the guide in conducting a community assessment, developing outreach strategies and planning the project's evaluation. Using the guide, the team has planned three outreach projects with target audiences including (a) students in a health career high school (b) patients and health professionals in a small-town clinic and (c) health professionals in a county health department. Cynthia Olney, the team's evaluation specialist, will present the outcomes of using the guide and discuss the evaluation tools used to supplement the guide.

---

**Housing High Risk Sex Offenders: The Challenges of Evaluating Multi-system Initiatives**

Think Tank Session 565 to be held in the Prince William room  
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG  
Facilitator: Judith Clegg, Clegg & Associates

Abstract: Programs involving collaboration across multiple systems are notoriously difficult to manage. And evaluating them gives rise to a special set of challenges. Add a difficult subject matter and study population - high risk sex offenders - and the challenge becomes exponentially more complex. Participants will wrestle with the impact that multiple systems have on the context for an evaluation design - differences in relevant program theories, lack of congruence in outcome expectations, diverse organizational cultures, and conflicting data management approaches. Participants will work in groups to explore the evaluation design for an innovative multi-system initiative to house high risk sex offenders. The issues they will discuss include: the questions the evaluator should address as the first step in the design process; the systems issues that will likely have an impact on successful completion of the evaluation; and the barriers and strategies that should be employed to ensure that the evaluation findings are used.

---

**Special Event: Friday, November 8, 2002 – 12:10 pm 1:45 pm**

**AEA Awards Luncheon**

*Note: Ticketed event, purchase tickets at the registration desk or when registering prior to the conference*

Luncheon Session 566 to be held in Ballroom E  
Hosts: Robin L Miller, University of Illinois at Chicago, AEA Conference Chair  
Molly Engle, Oregon State University, AEA President  
Patricia Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, AEA Awards Committee Chair
Evaluation 2002: Friday, November 8, 1:55 pm to 3:25 pm

Presidential Strand

Process Use: Challenges and Issues
MultiPaper Session 568 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG
Chair Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Insights into Process Use: Implications for Evaluation Theory and Practice
Presenters Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Barbra Zuckerman, Cutting Edge Consulting
Bonya Matthews, American Cancer Society
Abstract As collaborative and participatory approaches to evaluation are increasing, and as many organizations strive to become learning organizations, there is increasing interest in understanding what, how, when, and why stakeholders learn from their participation in an evaluation study. This learning has been referred to as process use (Patton, 1997) and constitutes the changes that occur in individuals’ and teams’ thinking and behavior about themselves, each other, the evaluand, the organization, and ultimately, about evaluation practice. This paper describes the findings of a research study that sought to understand the learning experiences of sixteen stakeholders who were Advisory Committee members in one or two evaluations conducted of the American Cancer Society’s Tell A Friend program. The findings from this research study may provide insights into how evaluators might conceptualize and design an evaluation to maximize process use.

Barriers to Program Evaluation: Program Staff Perspectives
Presenters Sandy M Taut, University of California at Los Angeles
Marvin C Alkin, University of California at Los Angeles
Abstract Following the first author’s empirical research on evaluation experts’ explanations for staff resistance to program evaluation (Taut, 2001), this paper focuses on staff perspectives. The authors conducted confidential semi-structured interviews with 16 key personnel of a large university outreach program. The interviews consisted of three parts: (1) staff attitudes toward evaluation, (2) staff explanations of barriers to evaluation (without prompts), (3) staff comments about explanatory factors of barriers to evaluation derived from evaluation research (Alkin, 1985). In addition to reflective memos, data analysis consisted of systematic categorization of interview transcripts. Statements from each of the three interview parts were coded using the main categories “human factors”, “evaluation factors”, and “context factors”, and various subcategories. The study’s main findings reinforce the importance of trust-building, continuous effective communication, and social competence of the evaluator. The authors report their attempts to achieve these goals, including the design of an evaluation project information form.

Evaluator Roles and Strategies for Expanding Evaluation Process Influence
Presenter Stephen M Morabito, National Center for Disability Services
Abstract This paper explores the various evaluator roles that have the potential to increase the likelihood that the evaluation process will have an influence on organizational systems and stakeholders. These roles are (1) educator, (2) consultant, (3) facilitator, and (4) counselor. These findings are based on evidence from a true evaluation scenario. Although the specific evaluation methodology implemented within an organization may have a large affect on how the evaluation process influences an organization, this paper focuses on the specific evaluator roles, philosophies, and interpersonal dynamics that hold the potential to foster a process influence. This is a significant contribution to the domain of evaluation use and influence because it will enable evaluators and organizations to develop and attain formal goals related to the evaluation process itself. Essentially, with knowledge of these roles and strategies, evaluators can promote their evaluative processes as having positive influence on organizational systems and stakeholders.

Conference Committee Strand

Using Evaluation Advisory Committees to Reform Systems
Panel Session 570 to be held in Ballroom C
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Chair Julie W Chambless, Chambless & Associates Inc
Discussant Jacob Silver, Huron Mountain Research Services
Session Abstract It is the hypothesis of this panel that a properly constituted evaluation advisory committee can be the nexus of power for the use of
evaluation to change and reform systems. The panel presentations will focus on the use of broad based evaluation advisory committees to ensure that evaluations are appropriately grounded in their complete systemic context at each phase in the evaluation process and that the differential needs, views, goals and values of the various program stakeholders are understood, valued and addressed. Use of an evaluation advisory committee not only helps to ensure the relevance of the evaluation design and implementation, but is an essential method for maximizing utilization of evaluation results. The panel will address the practical and political aspects of forming an evaluation advisory committee and present an array of examples of how utilization of evaluation committees promoted reform of social and health service systems.

**Promoting Evaluation Buy-in, Use and Quality: The Role of Evaluation Advisory Committees in the American Cancer Society**

**Presenter** Iris E Smith, American Cancer Society

**Abstract** In order to achieve its Mission, the American Cancer Society has developed a systematic process for the development, implementation and evaluation of cancer control programs, strategies and interventions, based on product development processes employed in the for-profit sector. ACS' Cancer Control Program Development Process involves six required steps beginning with need identification and ending with impact evaluation. This process provides an operational "road-map" and business standard that incorporates input from program stakeholders at each step of the process. Evaluation Advisory Committees (EACs) play a key role not only in shaping the evaluation questions and methodology but also in interpreting the data, developing dissemination plans and determining how the results of evaluations are used.

**Evaluation Advisory Committees and Impacts on Interdepartmental Planning Systems**

**Presenter** Marilyn L Ray, Finger Lakes Law & Social Policy Center Inc

**Abstract** This paper will report how an Evaluation Advisory Committee process eventually impacted the inter-government planning systems of the New York State Department of Social Services. In 1993, I negotiated Finger Lakes' first contract with NYS DSS Office of Program Evaluation to conduct the first federally mandated evaluation of the NYS Child Support Guidelines. During negotiations I learned there had been minimal joint planning between the State DSS and the Unified Court System prior to legislation requiring a collaborative child support system. Suggestions for establishing an EAC with representatives of the involved departments, state and county offices, and the courts, were denied. Over the course of five subsequent contracts, Finger Lakes was gradually successful in convincing the DSS that EACs were in everyone's best interests. Finally, I report on the sixth contract, which involved five government departments and two private organizations, and the impact a true EAC process had on the governmental planning system.

**From Action Research to Participatory Evaluation: Maintaining Social Reform**

**Presenter** Susan Boser, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

**Abstract** Through an action research project, a partnership of local government agencies, behavioral health providers, physicians and Medicaid consumers have created a not-for-profit Medicaid managed care plan in rural upstate New York. Desiring to maintain collaborative learning in administering the new plan, this same multi-sectoral partnership has created a Quality Improvement Plan incorporating each stakeholder group at all levels of the continuous evaluation process. This paper will present an overview of this evaluation plan and the role of multiple stakeholders in evaluation design, data-gathering, analysis and interpretation. It will highlight how this action research process changed the balance of power among stakeholders, and determined the role that evaluation will play in maintaining this new balance. The paper will conclude with a summary of the lessons learned from developing this design, and the implications this model has for on-going reform of the health and human service system in this region.

**The Impact of Evaluation Communities on Systems in the Field of Developmental Disabilities**

**Presenter** Anna F Lobosco, New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council

**Abstract** There is a great deal of compatibility between the current movement toward self-determination in the developmental disabilities field and concepts that underlie participatory evaluation. Thus, a combination of participatory and cluster evaluation methodologies has been employed with demonstration projects for initiating systemic change in human services. Each evaluation undertaken included an evaluation team with multiple and diverse stakeholders that included individuals with developmental disabilities and their family members. Including these stakeholders means rethinking evaluation roles, how information is presented and decisions made, and providing accommodations that will allow all decision makers to participate fully. Over time, some guidelines for including individuals with special needs have evolved. These guidelines address physical and sensory accommodations, including and engaging individuals with cognitive impairment, preparing and assisting support personnel, facilitating evaluation team deliberations, and presenting information for effective use by the evaluation team. These guidelines will be explained using illustrations from several evaluation projects.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**Theory-based Evaluation: A Systematic Evaluation of Change**

**MultiPaper Session 569 to be held in Ballroom B**

**Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG**
The present study examines the cost of operating an informal social support system through both professionals and paraprofessionals on mental and physical health outcomes. Existing research on costs of these types of programs has been consistently linked to enhanced outcomes relative to other variables. Research has focused on examining the effect of providing social support to family members through both professionals and paraprofessionals on mental and physical health outcomes.

**Organizing the Construction of Program Theory: Does It Make a Difference?**

**Presenter:** Peter Dahler-Larsen, Southern Denmark University

**Abstract:** An important part of theory-based evaluating is to facilitate, help or assist program staff or decisions makers articulate their programmatic theory of action (Patton). Does it matter how this process is organized? In a large evaluation program in Denmark, 10 municipalities and counties worked with theory-based evaluation over a two-year period. Each of them chose their own way to organize the generation of program theories. They differed with respect to 1) the degree of participation and involvement of program staff and decision makers; 2) the structuration of this process; 3) the number of groups or sites involved. This paper offers a systematic account of the different models of organization used to generate program theory in the 10 pilot projects. The paper describes how varying benefits from theory-based evaluation can be explained by variations in the organization of theory-making.

**The Use of Partial Least Squares for Program Theory: A Graphical and Quantitative Strategy to Study Logic Models**

**Presenter:** Eduardo A Molina, St Louis University

**Abstract:** The purpose of the study was to determine the robustness of partial least squares (PLS) to model program evaluation theory. In that sense, this investigation aimed to define a methodology that could allow evaluators to represent systematically and graphically the factors, inputs and outputs, affecting a program. The data was obtained from a student satisfaction survey designed to provide the administration, faculty, staff, and students of the University of Cincinnati with comprehensive data on student experiences and relationships at UC. Students from the 17 colleges within the University participated in the survey. 2,311 surveys were completed by UC students. The results showed that PLS helped to graphically present program theory and at the same time it provided statistical results that can quantify some of the factors conceptualized by logic models.

**Embedding Theory-driven Evaluation in a Qualitative Research Design**

**Presenter:** Arline H Inman, Arizona State University

**Abstract:** A paper describing a completed, theory-driven, qualitative evaluation of a three-year NSF funded program to attract women to engineering. The multiple, mixed method design embeds a theory-driven evaluation in a qualitative research design. The evaluation provides both the thick, rich description expected of qualitative evaluation along with information to improve program theory - a goal of theory-driven evaluation. Additionally, the instruments for focus groups, observations, surveys, and interviews are structured so they can be used at multiple levels of analysis and targeted to obtain information about program outcomes. These latter factors are important in evaluating systems where the parts of a system need to be evaluated as well as the system overall.

**Many Theories, One Evaluation: New Quantitative Methods That Honor the Varied Voices of Stakeholders**

**Presenter:** John Gargani, University of California at Berkeley

**Abstract:** This paper introduces a number of new methods for measuring, modeling, and using multiple theories of change in the context of Theory-Based Evaluation (TBE). Typically, evaluators who undertake TBE work collaboratively with stakeholders in order to build consensus around a single theory of change. When consensus cannot be reached, evaluators test competing theories. How are rival theories arrived at? Which rival theories should be tested? To what extent do the theories under consideration actually represent the views of relevant stakeholders? This paper describes how evaluators can answer these questions by using quantitative methods to "average" qualitative features found in multiple theories of change. Finally, the benefits of these methods are demonstrated in the context of an evaluation of a teacher development program.

**Evaluating Costs, Procedures, Processes, and Outcomes for Community-focused Service Systems: Supporting Housing, Paraprofessional Support Services, and Consumer-operated Mental Health Services**

**MultiPaper Session 571 to be held in Ballroom D**

**Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG**

**Chair:** Brian T Yates, American University

**Discussant:** Brian T Yates, American University

**Informal Social Support Programs, Outcomes, and Cost**

**Presenter:** Gazala Ansari, American University

**Abstract:** Social support programs for families with medical and mental health issues have proliferated in recent years, given that social support has been consistently linked to enhanced outcomes relative to other variables. Research has focused on examining the effect of providing social support to family members through both professionals and paraprofessionals on mental and physical health outcomes. Existing research on costs of these types of programs is limited; more comprehensive examinations of cost are non-existent! The present study examines the cost of operating an informal social support system.
program for mothers of children with emotional/behavioral disorders. In particular, a comprehensive examination of costs includes examining relationships between resources consumed per activity/procedure, activity/procedure participation and internal psychological changes, and those changes and outcomes in addition to traditional cost-effectiveness analyses. Results of examining these relationships yield important information about the link between outcomes and social support in the light of cost.

**Housing Unlimited Inc. Evaluation Proposal: Examining the Supported Housing Model Through Measures of Quality of Life, Symptom Severity, and Costs**

Presenter: Michael Freed, American University

**Who Utilizes Which Consumer-operated Services?**

Presenter: Gazala Ansari, American University

**Methodology in Calculating Cost per Visit and Cost per Consumer in a Consumer-operated Service**

Presenter: Michael Freed, American University

---

**Improving Interventions and Evaluations: Using a Systematic, Community and Theory Based Process**

Panel Session 572 to be held in the Washington A room

Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG

Chair: Aja Tulleners-Lesh, Azusa Pacific University

Discussant: Molly Engle, Oregon State University

Session Abstract: This multipaper session will begin with an overview of the history, components, and current exemplars of funded Community Based Research Programs (CBRP). The paper will integrate the concepts of theory based programs and LOGIC models in using evidence based practice (EBP) as it is adapted to local community context, optimizing the fidelity vs. salience tension. The second paper will describe an example of CBRP and the use of the Logic Model as it informed the refinement of an intervention program for children with asthma and their parents, and the subsequent plans for evaluation of this intervention. The third paper describes the application of this approach to harm reduction programs in high school settings with adolescents. The discussant will review the commonalities across the programs and describe challenges and opportunities.

**Components and Current Exemplars of Funded Community Based Research Programs (CBRP) in Evidence Based Practice**

Presenter: Martha Ann Carey, National Institute of Mental Health

Abstract: This paper will introduce the components, and current exemplars of funded Community Based Research Programs (CBRP). The paper will integrate the concepts of theory based programs and LOGIC models in using evidence based practice (EBP) as it is adapted to local community context, optimizing the fidelity vs. salience tension. The current emphasis within NIMH is to promote the generalizability of treatments, by setting as a priority for funding the development or adaptation of treatments that can be implemented in real-world settings. Emphasis is on studies of common treatments and services available in the community that focus on long-term follow-up of treated and untreated populations. Factors that facilitate or impede the portability or sustainability of evidence-based treatments will be identified including extra-organizational factors, organizational factors, practitioner attitudes and behaviors, and recipient attitudes and behaviors.

**Use of Focus Groups to Communicate the Logic behind the Logic Model**

Presenter: Aja Tulleners-Lesh, Azusa Pacific University

Abstract: Logic models are a basic element of evaluation that communicates the logic behind a program and its rationale. One of the main purposes of the logic model is to communicate the underlying “theory” or set of hypotheses that program proponents consider a good solution to an identified problem. Programs typically have multiple, sequential outcomes and a visual schematic is utilized to convey relationships between inputs, activities, and outcomes. This presentation focuses on the modification in the theory and the refinement of the interventions in a community-based intervention program for pediatric asthma. The results of nine focus groups with parents of children with asthma are utilized to modify the logic model. The initial model was focused on symptom management and drug treatment. Using parent participants to build “reach” into the model tended to avoid defining the impacts too narrowly and resulted in expanding the categories to introduce family dynamics, emotional impact, and economic stresses.

**To be announced**

Presenter: William Nigh, Center for Integrated Family and Health Services

---

**Evaluating Large and Small School Reforms: Design, Methods, and Instrumentation**

Demonstration Session 573 to be held in the Washington B room

Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
possess adequate knowledge to formulate educated opinions in regards to the success of the tutoring program in addressing stakeholder needs. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the goal is to make recommendations for the future development and improvement of the tutoring program.

The principal method of inquiry will be based mainly upon interview and survey methods. Interview method provides the opportunity to respond to the individual students' needs and provide instant feedback on progress. Interviews will be conducted with the tutors and students enrolled in the tutoring program. The evaluation process will be evaluated through summative observations since the evaluator has not experienced full participation in the tutoring program. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the goal is to present findings and recommendations for the future development and improvement of the tutoring program.
State-level Systems Change: The Case of Substance Abuse Prevention Process and Outcomes

Panel Session 575 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair: David Robbins, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention

Session Abstract: The panel consists of four papers presenting findings on changes in state substance abuse prevention systems. The papers reflect findings from state-level and cross-site evaluations of a major federally-funded substance abuse prevention initiative, the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention's State Incentive Grant (SIG) Program. SIG is aimed at changing state systems by coordinating and leveraging state and federal funding for prevention and developing a comprehensive prevention strategy emphasizing the implementation of science-based prevention programming. The first paper presents a cross-site analysis of state-level systems change, covering multiple states. The other papers cover the experiences of three states: Minnesota (where other state priorities dominated over substance abuse prevention), Kansas (where multiple state agencies synchronized their requirements for local funding initiatives, causing system-wide changes at the state and local levels), and Montana (where the Governor's office delegated authority for the program to the State substance abuse agency, diluting the potential program impact).

Hawthorne, Heisenberg and Happenstance: Evaluating Complex Systems Change
Presenter: Bruce Parsons, Social Research Institute
Abstract: Social Psychology informs us that simply being aware that they are being observed (evaluated) influences subjects (stakeholders, programs, and staff). Quantum Mechanics outlines a principle stating that a component of a particle's position and its associated momentum cannot be simultaneously observed with arbitrary accuracy or, in general, that measuring any quantity of a system will necessarily render some of its other quantities uncertain. Our experience tells us that new policies, programs and practices being implemented within a state system can be of sufficient magnitude to become rival hypotheses when attempting to explain outcomes. Our experience further tells us that these rival hypotheses (new initiatives) are typically not added to the system in the context of a strategic plan. This paper presents the case study findings of an evaluation of change within Montana's substance abuse prevention system as a result of implementing the State Incentive Grant Program.

Systems Change Through Comprehensive Statewide Prevention Planning
Presenter: Patty Martin, Southwest Prevention Center
Abstract: In 1997, Kansas received a State Incentive Grant (SIG), aimed at making state and community level systems changes for the reduction in substance abuse among youths 12-17 years of age. Kansas approached this initiative by: (1) creating a multi-agency Governor's Board to coordinate diverse state-level funding streams and synchronize support for local prevention efforts; (2) building the capacity of community partnerships to carry out comprehensive prevention planning, and (3) requiring the use of data driven, outcomes-based prevention practices in both state and local efforts. Findings from this study focus on the system changes brought about through these efforts.

Limitations of a Locally Driven Strategy for Comprehensive Statewide Prevention Planning
Presenters: Patricia S Seppanen, University of Minnesota
          Hans Scott-Myhre, University of Minnesota
Abstract: In 1998, Minnesota was awarded a State Incentive Grant intended to (1) develop a statewide alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention strategy focusing on youth; and (2) implement science-based prevention programs and strategies. From the time of the initial award and initial startup activities, a number of state-specific conditions began to both shape the implementation process and the articulation of targeted outcomes. A comparison of the actual systems change processes used in Minnesota between 1998-2001 and the initial project logic model put forward by the federal agency may be used to identify and illustrate the degree to which state-specific factors can overtake an initiative focused on statewide systems reform. The analysis is based on data that were collected via a variety of methods between 1999-2001, including indepth interviews, informal observations of meetings, document reviews, written surveys, and the secondary analysis of trend data from the Minnesota Student Survey.

Cross-case Analysis of Systems Change in the State Incentive Grant Program
Presenters: Margaret K Gwaltney, COSMOS Corporation
Abstract: In 1997, a federal agency initiated the State Incentive Grant (SIG) Program, aimed at making state level systems changes. These changes were to result in reduced substance abuse among youths 12-17 years of age. SIG explicitly stipulated the desired systems changes. States were to: (1) carry out comprehensive prevention planning, affecting communities throughout the state; (2) coordinate diverse state-level funding streams to synchronize support for local prevention efforts; and (3) encourage the use of science-based prevention practices in the local efforts. Since 1997, 39 states have received three-year SIG awards, distributed over four cohorts. The earliest states have now virtually completed their work, many with no-cost extensions that have covered fourth- and even fifth-year efforts. As part of their federal reporting requirements, each state conducted a state-level case study, covering the desired systems changes and the ensuing substance abuse prevention outcomes. The cross-state analysis is based on these case studies.
Vectoring: The Use of Multiple Evaluations to Determine Access to and Quality of Services

Panel Session 576 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG
Chair           Jack Molnar, US Department of Health and Human Services
Discussant     George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services
Presenters     Demetra Arapakos, US Department of Health and Human Services
                Jodi Nudelman, US Department of Health and Human Services
                Ellen Vinkey, US Department of Health and Human Services
                Jack Molnar, US Department of Health and Human Services

Session Abstract In this panel we will discuss how multiple studies can be used together to gain a clear and complete picture of how well a program is operating during a time of substantial and rapid change. We refer to this approach as "vectoring." Our examples pertain to nursing home and home health services, government programs recently impacted by legislative changes. We will show how a collection of studies was developed to provide a framework for monitoring these changes and provide feedback to interested parties. Of particular interest in our examples was whether beneficiary access to nursing home care and home health care had been adversely impacted by the legislative changes. Multi-year studies were used to address this concern. The panelists, who were team leaders in charge of these studies, will discuss: how we designed and managed longitudinal studies; how we used multiple data sources to support and supplement observations; and how the multiple evaluations planned and coordinated data collection, analysis, and presentation. The discussant will share observations regarding the value and impact of "vectoring" evaluations.

Incorporating Youth, Elders, and Disenfranchised Stakeholders in the Evaluation Process

MultiPaper Session 578 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair           To be announced

Using Evaluation to Turn Up the Volume of the Youth Voices Project

Presenter      June P Mead, Cornell University

Abstract       According to Konopka Institute's (2000) review of best practices, Schorr (1988), Dryfoos (1990), Benson (1998) and Pittman (1999), evaluation plays a significant role in successful youth-serving programs. Successful programs use evaluation to inform program design, improve program implementation and enhance positive youth development. This paper focuses on a series of innovative evaluation strategies being used in the Youth Voices Project to ensure youth participation and involvement in the program planning and implementation process. Examples will be drawn from the project's needs assessment where youth are using photography to concept map community strengths and weaknesses. The paper focuses on how evaluation is being used to not only "give voice" to young people, but also to "turn up" the volume of "youth voice" within the program.

Participatory Evaluation Within the Belizean Context

Presenter      Wilma N Wright, University of Louisville

Abstract       Participatory evaluation has recently been used to evaluate programs in developing countries. A major characteristic of participatory evaluation is the inclusion of disenfranchised stakeholders who are usually left out of the decision making process. Dialogue among stakeholders is a very important aspect of the process. In a developing country such as Belize there are several forces that hinder stakeholders from participating in the dialogical forums of participatory evaluation. Ethnicity, gender, language and one's urban/rural location are some of the factors that influence the types deliberative forums needed for participatory evaluation. This paper focuses on some of the factors within the Belizean context that evaluators employing participatory evaluation must understand if they are to include stakeholders in meaningful dialogue.

Youth Vision: Building the Evaluation Capacity of Youth Leaders

Presenter      Susan M Jenkins, Caliber Associates

Abstract       "YouthVision", developed by three national, non-profits, encourages youth to submit ideas for addressing local community problems. Selected sites work with the national partners to "make their idea a reality". This paper discusses evaluation challenges and successes encountered. The evaluation employed a multi-method approach to (1) measure effects of the national program on sites and of sites on their communities, and (2) increase participants' evaluation capacity. The evaluation team was intimately involved in all aspects of the initiative from applicant selection, to tracking technical assistance provided, to conducting evaluation sessions for sites. The evaluation team developed a workbook to help youth evaluate their programs. This
Reforming the Older Adult Education System In Australia: Empowering Older Adults in the Process

Presenter: Rosalind E Hurworth, The University of Melbourne
Anthea S Rutter, University of Melbourne

Abstract: Reforming the Older Adult Education System In Australia: Empowering Older Adults in the Process

Over the past few years the University of the Third Age (USA), a voluntary-based education program for the over 60s, has grown rapidly in Australia. During that time several major evaluations have been carried out in the State of Victoria in order to: assess older adult education and social needs; see education system can be improved for older people; and to look at ways of enhancing capacity (in terms of enhanced social capital better facilities and efficiencies in delivery). This paper concentrates particularly on how data collection, data analysis, and presenting the evaluation findings to local and state governments, provided an opportunity for older adults to be involved in the evaluation and political process which has led to changes in Statewide adult, community and further education provision. It will also demonstrate how older adults developed evaluation skills and were given the opportunity for dialogue with multiple stakeholders.

Ruling in the Program: Challenges of a Multi-site Abstinence Only Education Program Evaluation

Panel Session 579 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG
Chair: Michele Walsh, University of Arizona

Session Abstract: This panel addresses the broad array of challenges facing the Methodological and Political Context of the Arizona Abstinence Only Until Marriage Program

Presenter: Joanne Basta, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc

Abstract: Arizona is one of 53 U.S. states and territories that has received Title V, section 510(b) funding for Abstinence Only education. Although substantial federal and state funds have been committed to AO programming, very little rigorous evaluation of these projects has been conducted (Kirby, 1997). The program evokes very strong reactions from its proponents and its detractors, and so is subject to much political wrangling. One challenge was to develop an evaluation that was rigorous, yet feasible within the resources provided by the state, and that had credibility with a variety of stakeholders. In addition, the funds in Arizona are distributed across 17 sites statewide that serve approximately 20,000 participants ages 10 to adult in a variety of settings using a diversity of curricula. This posed considerable methodological challenges. This paper outlines the framework used to address both the political and methodological demands of the evaluation.

Ruling in the Program - Which Program?

Presenter: Jenifer McGuire, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc
Michele Walsh, University of Arizona

Abstract: Answering the question “Does the program work?” requires having an understanding of what the program is and how much of it is being provided to participants. Having multiple sites, however, often means having multiple programs. In order to aggregate findings across programs, evaluators must have an idea of the similarities and differences of the programs as implemented and be able to estimate the dosage of the program as given in various sites. This paper will discuss how we attempted to identify and measure the variation in programming across seventeen sites, including the development, coding and analysis of a Curriculum Content Questionnaire.

Getting Non-equivalent Comparison Group Designs (NECGD): The Search for Converging Evidence

Presenter: Michele Walsh, University of Arizona

Abstract: Very few multi-site evaluations are true randomized experiments. Most rely on non-equivalent comparison group designs (NECGD). Some do away with explicit comparison groups completely. This paper describes our attempt to formulate and implement a design and analysis plan that would strengthen the typical pre/post no-comparison group design often used in large-scale projects under state administration. Multiple strategies used included relying on program theory to examine expected patterns of results, estimating program dosage, developing cohort baseline comparison tables, implementing delayed treatment comparisons, and conducting follow-up surveys. Analytical techniques used included confirmatory factor analysis, general linear modeling, structural equations modeling, and multi-level modeling. Results and the strengths and limitations of the various approaches in practice will be discussed.

Building a Responsive Evaluation in a Challenging Context

Presenter: Monika Naegeli, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc
Abstract Designing and implementing a rigorous evaluation presents a series of challenges. Making the process and results of such an evaluation accessible, acceptable, and interpretable to program staff and funders pose additional challenges. This paper describes our multi-pronged approach to involving program and department of health staff in evaluation activities and to providing them with information that is accurate and useful for them at both the site and state level. Project successes and continuing hurdles will be discussed. This paper will present the contributions our efforts made toward the ongoing development of program and state administrative staff’s attitudes and knowledge about the evaluation process and how data were utilized to examine their programs.

**Evaluation Impacts: Assessing Local Government Presentation Programs**

MultiPaper Session 580 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG

**Evaluation of Technical Assistance Provision to School Districts in Illinois Implementing Violence Prevention Strategies**

Presenters Mary E Murray, Mary Murray & Associates
Eleni Makris, Illinois Violence Prevention Authority

Abstract This paper describes the evaluation of technical assistance provision to Illinois school districts to improve violence prevention efforts. Technical assistance was a component of a statewide Safe to Learn initiative provided funds to school districts to implement school security, violence prevention & intervention, crisis management and teacher & staff training through the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority. This evaluation served to answer process and outcome questions, including: 1) What was the range of technical assistance activities provided to districts? What were the characteristics of districts that utilized technical assistance offerings? What was the perceived impact of the assistance on district violence prevention efforts? Lessons learned about designing a statewide system of technical assistance delivery and the provision of technical assistance to school districts will be discussed. Implications for evaluation practice regarding self-evaluation, or program managers designing and implementing evaluation of a program for which they are responsible, will be addressed.

**Evaluating the Linkage Between Resource Allocation, Intervention Implementation and Community Priority Setting for HIV Prevention Programs in Los Angeles County**

Presenters Pamela C Ogata, Los Angeles County Office of AIDS Programs and Policy
Gunther Freehill, Los Angeles County Office of AIDS Programs and Policy
Mario J Perez, Los Angeles County Office of AIDS Programs and Policy

Abstract The CDC developed a framework for HIV prevention which includes eight core components that fall under planning, implementation, and results. The Office of AIDS Programs and Policy evaluated the linkage among three of these components: resource allocation, intervention implementation and community priority setting. Community priority setting in Los Angeles County is based on a planning model prioritizing and targeting individuals by behavioral risk groups. An analysis of the linkage among recommended priorities, resource allocation, and estimated proportion of prevention service clients utilized the following data sources 1) monthly provider reports, 2) contractor inventory, and 3) the Countywide Risk Assessment Survey. Successes, limitations, and recommendations will be discussed and include an overview of data sources and data collection strategies. In a climate of limited and even diminishing resources, it is even more critical to target those individuals at highest risk of HIV infection and to allocate resources accordingly.

**Can This Collaboration be Saved?**

Presenter Christine Roberts, University of Washington

Abstract Like Pacific Northwest weather, the one constant about state and local government procedures is change. Change often meets with resistance, even when it's desired. Washington State agencies involved in substance abuse prevention developed a collaborative needs assessment (CNA) at the request of and for use by their county level constituents. At the state level, only three out of seven agencies found CNA results useful. All of Washington's counties completed the CNA process and report because they were funding requirements, but the responses of county level constituents varied from positive to hostile. The purpose of this formative evaluation case study is to suggest methods for enhancing CNA adoption rates at state and county levels. The evaluation uses diffusion of innovation theory and models to determine barriers to and enhancers of CNA adoption as a procedural innovation at state and county levels.

**What Am I Doing and How Did I Get Here? Advice to Those Seeking Careers in Various Evaluation Fields**
Meta-Roundtable Session 581 to be held in the Tidewater room
Sponsored by the Graduate Student TIG
Chair       Jennifer D Dewey, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
Discussants Dennis P Affholter, Institute for Social and Economic Development
                                      Darryl L J Inkerson, Abilene Christian University
                                      Jackie W Kaye, The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
                                      Zenda M Ofir, Evalnet
                                      J im Rugh, CARE International
                                      Craig Russon, WK Kellogg Foundation
                                      Mildred E Savidge, University of New England
                                      Jennifer E Williams, University of Cincinnati
                                      Jeffrey Anderson, AchieveGlobal
                                      David Bowering, DJ Bowering Associates
                                      Antoniette B Brown, Eurasia Foundation
                                      Stanley J Capela, Heartshare Human Services
                                      Thomas J Chapel, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
                                      Maryann Durland, Durland Consulting Inc
                                      Kimberly A Fredericks, State University of New York at Albany
                                      Robert N Harris, National-Louis University

Session Abstract As a forum for evaluators either searching for a first job, looking to move into a different position, or gathering information to compare career options in various fields, this roundtable presents the opportunity to dialogue with evaluators, with varying length of experience, in multiple fields regarding: 1) Primary roles and responsibilities, 2) Benefits and areas of caution of evaluation work, 3) Path they took to their current position, and 4) Advice to those seeking careers in the field. The following fields will be represented at the tables: business and industry, education, independent consulting, and not-for-profit. Audience members will have the opportunity to move freely from table to table during the 90-minute session to meet and talk with evaluators in various fields. At the end of the presentation, both discussants and audience members will have the opportunity to briefly share lessons learned.

Multidisciplinary Graduate Education in Science and Technology: NSF’s Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) Program
Panel Session 582 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair       Conrad G Katzenmeyer, National Science Foundation
Discussant   Paul W Jennings, National Science Foundation

Session Abstract This panel will discuss an ongoing evaluation of a National Science
The IGERT Program and Its Evaluation
Presenter   Anne M Chase, Abt Associates Inc
Abstract As project director for this evaluation project, Dr. Chase will: describe the development of the IGERT program within the context of changing perspectives on science graduate education and the support of graduate education by NSF; set forth the structures and goals of the IGERT program; and describe the development of the evaluation design, the focal questions addressed, the data sources, and the methodologies used.

The Web-based Survey: Methods and Results
Presenter   Jennifer Giancola, Abt Associates Inc
Abstract As part of our IGERT evaluation, all Principal Investigators and NSF-funded students complete an survey annually using the World Wide Web. This paper discusses the methodology of administering a survey electronically and survey results. It describes the benefits and challenges associated with an on-line survey and explains how the information collected fulfills the data needs of NSF and the IGERT Program Office (for GPRA and Congressional reports). It also provides preliminary findings from the program’s first three years, including early success measures. Many of these findings revolve around the multidisciplinary nature of the IGERT projects, which both creates implementation challenges as projects shift away from traditional departmental disciplinary cultures, and opens up new opportunities and creative research advances as disciplines come together. The development of IGERT graduate programs has spawned the creation of numerous experiences for graduate students, including research internship opportunities at other institutions, outside
companies, and government agencies.

**Field-based Data Collection: Methods and Results**

**Presenter**  Beth Gamse, Abt Associates Inc

**Abstract**  This paper summarizes findings from site visits to IGERT projects in their third year of operation in 2001-02. The 17 IHEs represent public and private institutions, with interdisciplinary programs that range from environmental sciences to non-linear systems to socio-economic inequality. The site visits include structured interviews with PIs, faculty, relevant administrators, and trainees; as well as peer scientists' assessments of the quality of intellectual preparation/training. Information from these visits highlights how different institutions (and their respective departments) deal with such facets of an interdisciplinary graduate educational program as: admissions (e.g., are students admitted into only one participating department or by a cross-departmental committee), departmental and/or programmatic course requirements, lab or internship requirements, identification of major advisors across departments, and composition of thesis committees. Data from the site visits will serve to validate and expand upon data collected through the internet surveys, particularly in terms of the graduate students' experiences.

**The Process of Cultural Change in Graduate Education and Training Through IGERT**

**Presenter**  Carolyn Layzer, Abt Associates Inc

**Abstract**  Through the IGERT program, NSF aims "to catalyze a cultural change in graduate education, for students, faculty, and universities." To this end, NSF sponsors annual meetings of IGERT principal investigators and university administrator at which individual project highlights and challenges are shared. During the year, as faculty and administrators develop their individual projects following the guidelines set out in their NSF proposals, an imagined community of practice is evolving. Among the products of this community of practice are: a culture of multidisciplinary work, consortial relationships, and an incipient model of graduate education and training. In addition to these cultural elements, shared problems can be identified and, with the help of NSF, central solutions may be developed. Using data from the meetings of IGERT principal investigators, site visits, and the web-based surveys, this paper explores the process of cultural change in the larger IGERT community.

**How Can Federal Agencies Implement the Research and Development Investment Criteria?**

**Think Tank Session 583 to be held in the Jefferson room**

**Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG**

**Facilitator**  Gretchen B. Jordan, Sandia National Laboratories

**Abstract**  All requests for federal funding of basic and applied research will be reviewed according to criteria being developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) beginning in the fiscal year 2004 budget cycle. This is part of the White House efforts to implement The President's Management Agenda, which was released Aug. 24, 2001. The criteria OMB used in a pilot for applied research funding included presidential priority, clear public benefit, best means to accomplish the federal goal, the project plan and measurement, and past performance. These criteria are being modified in Spring 2002. The draft criteria for basic research are quality, relevance, and performance in terms of management and results. After a brief update on the status of the OMB R&D investment criteria and implementation, we will break into small groups to consider the near term effects, how to improve the criteria, how to link these with GPRA, and the role evaluators can play.

**Sources of Bias in Estimating Treatment Effects**

**MultiPaper Session 584 to be held in the Lincoln room**

**Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG**

**Chair**  Lee B. Sechrest, University of Arizona

**Method Variance as a Source of Bias**

**Presenter**  Melinda Davis, University of Arizona

**Abstract**  Method variance is bias attributable to the measuring process. Methods include characteristics of the measuring instrument and measuring process. Method variance can inflate a treatment outcome, making it appear that all subjects have benefited. The effect due to method may be larger than the treatment effect, obliterating any real differences. Method effects have been shown to interact with the level of the trait, further obscuring outcome assessments. Solutions include the use of multiple methods, choosing those with smaller method effects, and intentionally varying the sources of bias. Multiple methods require multivariate analyses, such as latent variable modeling, to remove or reduce method effects from the outcome variables.

**The Masking Effect of Response Shift in Detecting True Change**

**Presenter**  Victoria L. Brown, University of Arizona
USAID Evaluation and Resource Flows for Foreign Assistance
Panel Session 585 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair: Molly Hageboeck, Management Systems International
Presenters: Cynthia Clapp-Wincek, Independent Consultant
Richard Blue, Independent Consultant
Molly Hageboeck, Management Systems International
Session Abstract: A panel discussion of how a metaevaluation of USAID’s evaluation system has or hasn’t changed it and how USAID’s evaluation system has been affected by its systemic context. The authors of the “Evaluation of USAID’s Evaluation System” will discuss systemic reforms following the 2001 metaevaluation. In some cases, changes responded to evaluation findings. The session will also address how USAID’s changing political environment has affected the evaluation system, focusing specifically on the need to demonstrate aid effectiveness in order to ensure resource flows to poor countries.

Reforming Teacher Evaluation Systems: Evaluation Methods and Findings for Evaluating a Standards Based Teacher Evaluation System
MultiPaper Session 586 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair: Herbert G Heneman III, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Transforming Teacher Evaluation: A Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation System
Presenters: Herbert G Heneman III, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Tony Milanowski, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Abstract: This paper describes the standards-based teacher evaluation system recently designed and implemented in the Cincinnati Public Schools, and the theory of action linking the evaluation system with improvements in instructional practice and ultimately improved student achievement. The evaluation system, based on the Framework for Teaching, was the product of a joint union-management effort to define good teaching in the district. The evaluation system, and the proposed linkage of evaluation results to teacher pay and professional development is intended to focus teacher attention and effort on improving instructional practice. Besides providing the context for the paper that follows, the paper also describes the design process that led up to the implementation of the system, administrator and peer evaluator experiences using the system, the consistency of administrator and peer evaluator evaluation decisions, and the lessons learned and changes made based on these experiences.
Assessment of Teacher Reactions to a Standards-based Teacher Evaluation System
Presenters: Tony Milanowski, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Herbert G Heneman III, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Certification Process for Evaluators in a Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation System
Presenter: Jack Lewis, Cincinnati Public Schools
Validation of a Standards-based Teacher Evaluation System: Does Student Achievement Match Teacher Evaluation
Presenter: Elizabeth A Holtzapple, Cincinnati Public Schools

Independent Consulting: How We Got Here and What We do
Panel Session 587 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG
Chair: Jo Ann Doino-Ingersoll, Strategic Research
Presenters: Jo Ann Doino-Ingersoll, Strategic Research
Evaluation Issues in Crime and Justice Programs
MultiPaper Session 588 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG
Chair
Sharon L Caudle, US General Accounting Office

Homeland Security Management: Evaluation Challenges
Presenter
Sharon L Caudle, US General Accounting Office

Abstract
This paper explores the opportunities and challenges in evaluating homeland security activities and their results. Homeland security comprises many key functions, such as detecting, preventing, protecting against, responding to domestic attacks, and devising countermeasures to potential future threats. Carrying out these functions and thus responding to homeland security demands means 1) addressing constantly changing threats that are often impossible to predict in a vast and vulnerable country, 2) sustaining efforts over a long time period, 3) blurring lines between foreign and homeland defense and war and disaster, 4) operating domestically and internationally, 5) managing in multiple policy domains such as law enforcement, public health, and border security, 6) operationalizing acceptable risk for specific targets and threats, 7) relying on multiple federal, state, local, and private organizations, and 8) leveraging resources that will be finite and must meet multiple uses. These features create a complex evaluation environment taxing evaluation capabilities.

One Program, Many Funders, How Many Evaluations?
Presenters
Elizabeth Ann O'Sullivan, North Carolina State University
Edwin P Miller, Research and Evaluation Associates

Abstract
Theoretically programs that receive money from more than one funder may contend with markedly different evaluation requirements, which increase the program costs and limit its effective use of evaluation findings. To document the problem of conflicting evaluation demands and their consequences this paper examines three cases. The cases are youth offender programs in different states. They represent fully-implemented on-going programs, which rely on funding from federal, state, and local governments and foundations. For case we identify competing evaluation demands, how the program conducts evaluation, and how the program and its funders use the findings. We then compare and contrast the findings to develop hypotheses about how agencies resolve competing demands and how competing demands affect evaluation quality and utilization.

Strategic Planning in Applied Research
Presenters
John Roman, The Urban Institute
Shelli Rossman, The Urban Institute

Abstract
Increasingly, funders and designers of innovative social programming are turning to the evaluation community for assistance in both the design and guided evolution of interventions. Whereas the traditional role of the evaluator in outcome or impact evaluations requires a clear delineation of roles, the development of practitioner-evaluator partnerships demands a more collaborative relationship. Such a partnership, if properly designed and executed, yields programs that are rigorously evidence-based and well positioned to be seriously studied. However, the evaluator’s role in the development and operation of a program can not only confound evaluation outcomes, but also potentially has adverse impacts on the program once the evaluator concludes his/her work. The answer to this conundrum, we believe, lies in the development of strategic planning models as the initial evaluative foray into research-practitioner collaborations.
Conference Session: Friday, November 8, 2002 - 3:35 pm to 5:05 pm

**Presidential Strand**

**Systems Concepts, Systems Methods, and Evaluation Practice: An Exploration - Part Two**

*Note: Part one to this session is on Thursday, November 7, from 1:40 pm to 3:10 pm in session 374*

Skill-building Workshop Session 590 to be held in Ballroom A

Sponsored by the Presidential Strand

Chair: Bob Williams, Independent Consultant

Presenters: Bob Williams, Independent Consultant

Patricia J. Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

Glenda H Eoyang, Chaos Limited Inc

Abstract: This workshop helps evaluators explore the strengths and weaknesses of using particular systems approaches in their evaluations. It covers three areas: 1) A range of quite different approaches to systems based inquiry; 2) The strengths and weaknesses of these approaches in relation to evaluation; 3) What this means for participants' own evaluation practice. A 'systems' approach to evaluation isn't a licence to include everything. It's easy to get hopelessly lost that way. Knowing what to exclude and how to do it, are the real skills. There are two parts to this. First, understand what does and does not constitute a 'system'. Second use systems methodologies that fit the task. The problem? There are dozens of them. How do you chose among them? The Part One focused on the practical importance of understanding systems principles. This session explores the strengths, weakness and relevance of three very different systems methodologies - system dynamics, soft systems, and complexity. Preferably participants should have attended Part One.

**Presidential Strand**

**Being a Real Evaluator: Creating a Process that Improves Conferences and Conference Evaluation**

MultiPaper Session 592 to be held in Ballroom C

Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee

Chair: Jean A King, University of Minnesota

Discussants: Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico

Lyn M Shulha, Queen's University

Susan Kistler, American Evaluation Association

Abstract: This paper examines critical issues in the evaluation of professional conferences to provide insight about conference evaluation for improvement or making longitudinal comparisons. Based on an analysis of the literature, the paper will document that the current state of research on the evaluating of conferences is very limited particularly as it pertains to the evaluation process. The gap in the scholar literature prompted the authors also to use information from evaluation reports and online publications, as well as to look at the literature on the evaluation of training programs. A conceptual framework for studying conference evaluation will be presented, the goal being to provide information of use to evaluators interested in conducting conference evaluation. It is important because adults increasingly will learn in short-term settings and the value of good evaluation will be in helping to improve their learning.

**The Client Experience: Are We Getting What We Paid for?**

Presenter: John G Smith, University of Minnesota

**Speaking Truth to Power: The Student as AEA Evaluator**

Presenter: Lesley Lilligren, University of Minnesota

**Changing the System: Lessons Learned About Conference Evaluation**

Presenter: Gwen M Willems, University of Minnesota

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Evaluation Theory Classification Systems: Understanding Individual Evaluation Theories in Relationship to One Another**
The Challenge of Integrating Outcome Measurement

**Demonstration Session 593 to be held in Ballroom D**  
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG  
Chair: Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant  
Presenters: Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant  
Sandra Ortega, The Ounce of Prevention Fund of Florida  
Christina Olenik Lynch, Partners in Evaluation & Planning

**Abstract**  
So, what do we do once we get them? The Challenge of Integrating Outcome Measures. Outcomes measurement is all the rage these days. However, integrating the results of outcome measurement is a more difficult task for most programs to put into practice. In this demonstration we will be introducing many tools and resources (e.g., a logic model guide, an evaluation cycle worksheet, as well as real-life examples) to walk participants through a clear, step-by-step explanation of how agencies come to integrate outcome measurement into their programs. Implementation of outcome measures is best applied when workers concentrate on developing strategies to maintain or improve services. The best strategy for outcome measurement encourages participation from all stakeholders throughout the planning, interpretation, and integration processes. When the evaluation process encourages participation from a wide platform of stakeholders from the beginning, systemic reform is achievable through integrating information gained from outcome measurement systems.

Concept Mapping for Stakeholder-driven Collaborative Decision Making in Health Planning and Evaluation

**MultiPaper Session 594 to be held in the Washington A room**  
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG  
Chair: William M Trochim, Cornell University  
Discussant: William M Trochim, Cornell University  
Planning for Comprehensive Cancer Control

**Presenters**  
Lori Belle-Isle, American Cancer Society  
Jon Kerner, National Cancer Institute  
Leslie Given, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Bruce Black, American Cancer Society  
Jeanine Draut, Concept Systems Inc

**Abstract**  
The American Cancer Society (ACS), with the support of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has completed delivering a series of Leadership Institutes in each of its regions. Each institute was made up of the key stakeholders within each state in the region. These stakeholders included public health professions, physicians, administrators, advocates, and so on. A desired outcome of the institutes was to get multiple stakeholders from multiple organizations to develop action steps necessary to further the development of comprehensive cancer control planning and/or implementation of the existing plan for comprehensive cancer control. A necessary precursor to developing action plans is consensus on the issues that need to be addressed and the priorities among those issues. Concept mapping was implemented in six of these institutes. In advance of each institute, stakeholders participated in the data collections phases of concept mapping. At the institute, results were shared with attendees. As a result, discussion was based on evidence about areas of common interest and priority as well as areas where substantial differences existed. States will use the framework created at the institutes to develop evaluation plans relevant to their cancer plan.

Developing a State Plan to Reduce the Impact of Cancer
Developing an Evaluation Framework: Insuring National Excellence for the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) Prevention Research Centers [Project DEFINE]

Presenters
Lynda Anderson, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Ross Brownson, Saint Louis University
Margaret K Gwaltney, COSMOS Corporation
Dan McLinden, Concept Systems Inc

Building Capacity for Local Evaluations
MultiPaper Session 595 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Barry B Cohen, Rainbow Research Inc

Using the Joint Committee Standards to Evaluate Students in a Private School Setting
Presenter Jacqueline P Kelleher, Ethel Walker School
Abstract In order to reform and change a system or method for completing tasks, concrete evaluation practices are necessary. Today, private schools are beginning to turn toward effective evaluation methods in order to ensure good teaching and learning practices. Recently, the Ethel Walker School used the Joint Committee Standards on Evaluation to change programs. This is the first time concrete evaluation practices were implemented and this paper offers a first hand look at the tools, design, process, and results. The evaluator will share her reflections and address resistance she encountered in attempting to evoke change in the private school environment.

Evaluation in the Context of the Classroom: Developing a Culture of Self-Evaluation
Presenter Jennifer Coyne-Cassata, Fairfax County Public Schools
Abstract The purpose of this paper is to describe the culture of evaluation at work in a seventh-grade classroom, including the teacher’s sense of evaluation and confidence in her abilities to evaluate, the students’ awareness of the evaluative practices at work, and the relationship of these evaluative practices to larger evaluation policies and standards. As part of a larger study into student self-evaluation in writing, the teacher was engaged in evaluative activities, with a focus on teacher and student self-evaluation as well as the teacher’s evaluations of students. This paper presents the findings and describes how the teacher used the activities and evaluative approaches with all of her classes. Also, the paper describes the continued evaluation practices in use by the teacher after two years, as well as the teacher’s perceptions of how her current evaluative practices could be enhanced by efforts to develop professional standards for student evaluation (JCSEE, 2002).

Longitudinal Evaluation of an Inquiry-based, Student-centered High-school Science Research Program: Themes That Emerge From Stakeholder Perceptions Across Time
Presenters Dean T Spaulding, State University of New York at Albany
Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany
Kim Lanaro, State University of New York at Albany
Leigh Mountain, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract Utilizing a seven year cohort model, this evaluation gathered both quantitative stakeholder survey data from time of implementation as well as qualitative interview data from stakeholders during periodic school site visits. Examination of the data revealed three key themes: stakeholder perceptions as to the benefits for students participating in such programs, infrastructure for program implementation, and changes in teacher instructional practices. In addition, it was also noted that in several schools, the surrounding communities became more involved in this program through lending additional support, materials, and other resources.

Program Planning and Evaluation and Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
MultiPaper Session 596 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Social Work and the Human Services Evaluation TIG
Chair Eileen A Robertson-Rehberg, Hope College
Evaluation Study of Gender-specific Programs for Delinquent, Diverted and High-risk Female Youth
The presentation and paper will evaluate the effectiveness of gender-specific programs in the context of personal issues of young women on the edge of the juvenile justice system. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software will be used in this study for the correlation of neighborhood characteristics with the attributes of the young women aged 12-17, as they participate in different programs, ranging from community-based to residential. The factors to be mapped include demographics, housing stability, school and work performance, service history, peer and community support, trauma and coping skills, substance use, delinquency, and reproductive health and parenting experience. This evaluation is a federally funded study of high-risk young women involved in the juvenile justice system within a large urban setting. Data gathered on each individual provides detailed information on many risk and protective factors, the participant's service use history, and her experiences of discrimination and other barriers to service.

**Participatory Action Research and the Youth Campaign Against HIV/AIDS in Ghana**

Presenter: Virgil N Mensah-Dartey, Cornell University

**Society and the environment: An evaluation of a community development program in Upstate New York**

Presenter: Eileen A Robertson-Rehberg, Hope College

---

**Improving Housing for Persons with Serious Mental Illness: Final Results from the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) Housing Initiative**

Panel Session 597 to be held in the Potomac II room

Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG

Chair: Robert Paulson, University of South Florida

Discussant: Robert Paulson, University of South Florida

**Session Abstract**

The CMHS Housing Initiative is a federally supported multi-site study examining whether supported housing is more effective than other approaches in the traditional residential continuum in helping persons with serious mental illness. This panel presents cross-site findings from the study, including results from HLM analyses of changes in such outcomes as residential stability, mental health functioning, and isolation. The ‘fidelity’ of housing programs to a supported housing ideal and whether variations in fidelity affect outcomes will also be presented, along with an examination of differences in services received by study participants, in both different types of housing and over time. Finally, the experiences of movers versus non-movers, regardless of initial housing placement, will be examined, including whether specific housing features contribute to better outcomes for each group. The implications of these results for improving our service systems responses to persons with serious mental illness will be also be discussed.

**Housing Matters: Final Results from the CMHS Housing Initiative**

Presenters: Debra J Rog, Vanderbilt University

C Scott Holupka, Vanderbilt University

Molly Lynch, Vanderbilt University

Anja K Kurki, Vanderbilt University

**Abstract**

This presentation summarizes outcome results from the CMHS Housing Initiative for Persons with Serious Mental Illness, the largest study of supported housing to date. Dr. Rog will begin the presentation with a brief overview of the Initiative, a study comparing supported housing to a range of housing approaches in the traditional residential continuum in six sites. The results of cross-site analyses using hierarchical linear modeling for 3, 6, 12, and 18-month data will be presented for several outcomes including residential stability, mental health functioning, psychiatric hospitalization, and consumer empowerment. Preliminary results suggest that "housing matters," as both residents of supported housing and other housing approaches show equivalent increases in residential stability and fewer psychiatric hospitalizations after entering housing. Moderator variables have also been included in the outcome models. Dr. Rog will discuss how this has revealed several interesting subgroup effects that do not seem to vary by housing type. The implications of these results for practice and further research will be noted.
Abstract This is an exploratory study of the attitudes towards mental illness among Mexican Americans that can influence their willingness to seek mental health services.  The dependent variable will be operationalized using three variables: beliefs about mental illness and mental health professionals, acculturation, and knowledge about mental health services.  Using the population of Mexican-Americans between ages of 18-50 a sample (N=30) will be examined.  A 30-item questionnaire will be administered including demographic information and immigration status.  The results will show middle to low scores in willingness to seek mental health service overall. This study was unable to measure demonstrate a significant relationship to willingness to seek mental health services. However, this study does provide clarification into the variables that demonstrate the beliefs, acculturation and knowledge of Mexican-American regarding mental health.

Increasing Minority Student Interest in the Field of Evaluation: A Social Work Perspective

Many institutions struggle to recruit and retain minority students in their doctoral programs. Two of the main reasons for the same can
be attributed to lack of monetary resources for assistantships and the paucity of quality mentors in their respective fields. This is more common in the profession of social work since many of the students enrolled in the program are non-traditional students. This paper will highlight the way in which a public university partnered with the state mental health department to provide the necessary monetary and educational opportunities needed for a minority student to be a part of the team to evaluate mental health programs. The paper will show how establishing contacts with the state agency and learning from practitioners in the field helped the student gain real-life evaluation experiences. Through this partnership and experience, the student has undertaken a much larger evaluation project for her dissertation.

Inclusive Accountability: Can You Have Both an Inclusive Stakeholder Process and an Accountability Framework in Your Evaluation Design?
Panel Session 600 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair: Jane L Reisman, The Evaluation Forum
Discussant: Jane L Reisman, The Evaluation Forum

Session Abstract: This panel will explore how evaluation can be used to both engage stakeholders in a learning process as well as provide an accountability framework for achieving programmatic and community goals. Topics will include: (1) expectations of the evaluation process, (2) expectations of the uses of evaluation, and (3) approaches that integrate accountability and inclusivity. Models that will be examined include results-based frameworks, theories of change, and learning partnerships.

The Foundation Consortium's Perspective
Presenter: Francesca Wright, The Foundation Consortium
Abstract: The mission of the Foundation Consortium is to improve the well-being of California children, families, and communities through influencing public policy and improving practice at the state, county, and local levels. A results-based framework has been an important part of guiding the Foundation Consortium's work in these areas. The Foundation Consortium has modified existing results frameworks to more strongly emphasize community involvement in the development of indicators of performance. This is consistent with their key principles of family involvement, community partnership and shared accountability.

Annie E Casey's Making Connections Initiative Perspective
Presenter: Tom Kelly, Annie E Casey Foundation
Abstract: The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Making Connections Initiative aims to stimulate and support a local movement that engages residents, civic groups, political leaders, grassroots groups, public and private sector leadership, and faith-based organizations to help transform tough neighborhoods into family-supportive environments. Making Connections promotes a dual framework for evaluating this social change initiative: results accountability and learning partnerships. This presentation will discuss how these two approaches support each other as well as maintain independent purposes from each other.

The Evaluation Forum's Perspective
Presenter: Anne Gienapp, The Evaluation Forum
Abstract: The Evaluation Forum's mission is to help organizations define and measure outcomes. The Evaluation Forum initiates its evaluation consultation work with active communication about the purposes and audiences of an evaluation effort--particularly regarding accountability and program development issues. Articulation of evaluation purposes and audiences is critical for developing an approach that will ensure an investment in the evaluation products. Through the use of logic models and other theories of change frameworks, various stakeholders are able to clarify activities and related outcomes. The process of articulating theories of change can elicit areas where different stakeholders--such as program staff, program participants, and funders--may have different perspectives and priorities regarding outcome selection and measurement strategies. The Evaluation Forum strives to bridge these differences in order to develop evaluation processes that yield the most useful and relevant products.

Are We Moving? Efforts and Effects of the Federal Regional Resource Center Network in State Special Education System Changes
Panel Session 601 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG
Chair: Pat Mueller, Northeast Regional Resource Center
The overall strategy for WRRC planning and evaluating its technical assistance involves relating this assistance to the client states' goals and performance local school districts, consumers, families). Providing and evaluating technical assistance within this context poses an interesting opportunity to the WRRC.

The broader state education system and their efforts to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities involve many partners (other state agencies, Presenter established criteria for success of future MPRRC assistance in those areas of needs. determine if the right questions have been posed relative to a stateÆs areas of improvement needs; to contribute to identifying current or future needs; and to impacts of technical assistance, responding to the effect such assistance has had on the stateÆs own goals. This stakeholder group will also be used to improvement goals. One aspect of this particular model will involve engaging state stakeholders in a facilitated, indepth analysis of the cumulative results and measures, both for the quality and effect of its technical assistance, as well as for the extent to which that assistance affects a state's specific performance or improvement goals. Increasing emphasis upon "effect" rather than "effort" requires that state systems show identified by states in their needs assessment and improvement planning. SERRCÆs evaluation system determines the effectiveness and quality of technical assistance, and measures its impact on the original statewide need. Increasing emphasis upon "effect" rather than "effort" requires that state systems show results. SERRC is piloting a model that incorporates evaluation data from state improvement activities with impact of SERRC technical assistance to demonstrate systemic changes. States receiving State Improvement Grants (SIGs) target identified state needs and are evaluated using outcome data that describe results and effects. The SERRC pilot measures the SIG quantitative data to determine the level of impact. This model and preliminary data will be presented.

MidSouth Regional Resource Center
Presenter Paula Burdette, MidSouth Regional Resource Center
Abstract The MidSouth RRC (MSRRC) presentation will consist of discussing the various strategies we use to gather, store, analyze, and report data. Quality decision making fundamentally rests on gathering enough data to give an accurate picture of the activity. Next, since we are working with minimal resources, including personnel, our data storage must be efficient as well as effective. Data analysis, while somewhat sophisticated, must be intuitive, and data reporting must be structured yet useful. Our evaluation team has borrowed strategies from other evaluators, especially within the RRC Network. We will discuss how we combine these to make an essential and cohesive evaluation system. The methods we use determine whether our staff is able to influence systemic change in our nine-state region.

Southeast Regional Resource Center
Presenter Betty Beale, Auburn University
Abstract Southeast RRC (SERRC) technical assistance is shaped by the systemic context in which it operates. SERRC service targets gaps identified by states in their needs assessment and improvement planning. SERRCÆs evaluation system determines the effectiveness and quality of technical assistance, and measures its impact on the original statewide need. Increasing emphasis upon "effect" rather than "effort" requires that state systems show results. SERRC is piloting a model that incorporates evaluation data from state improvement activities with impact of SERRC technical assistance to demonstrate systemic changes. States receiving State Improvement Grants (SIGs) target identified state needs and are evaluated using outcome data that describe results and effects. The SERRC pilot measures the SIG quantitative data to determine the level of impact. This model and preliminary data will be presented.

Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
Presenter Carol Massanari, Mountain Plains RRC
Abstract Mountain Plains RRC (MPRRC) will describe its efforts to design a logic model which contains critical and desired performance measures, both for the quality and effect of its technical assistance, as well as for the extent to which that assistance affects a state's specific performance or improvement goals. One aspect of this particular model will involve engaging state stakeholders in a facilitated, indepth analysis of the cumulative results and impacts of technical assistance, responding to the effect such assistance has had on the stateÆs own goals. This stakeholder group will also be used to determine if the right questions have been posed relative to a stateÆs areas of improvement needs; to contribute to identifying current or future needs; and to establish criteria for success of future MPRRC assistance in those areas of needs.

Western Regional Resource Center
Presenter Arlene Russell-Bender, University of Oregon
Abstract Western RRC (WRRC) provides technical assistance to state special education agencies (SEAs). These SEAs operate in the context of the broader state education system and their efforts to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities involve many partners (other state agencies, local school districts, consumers, families). Providing and evaluating technical assistance within this context poses an interesting opportunity to the WRRC. The overall strategy for WRRC planning and evaluating its technical assistance involves relating this assistance to the client states' goals and performance...
measures. This alignment facilitates linking state efforts with WRRC contributions to improvements in the broader state education system. A particular aim of WRRC evaluation is to engage SEA clients in its design. The WRRC presentation will discuss successes and challenges in this endeavor and describe how recent demand at the federal level for states to report databased performance information has influenced WRRC evaluation practices.

Human Resources: The Evaluative Component

MultiPaper Session 602 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Chair  Apollos B Goyol, Western Michigan University

Proposal for the Evaluation of Local Government Chairmen in Nigeria
Presenter  Apollos B Goyol, Western Michigan University
Abstract  Nigeria since her independence in 1960 has alternated civilians with military rule. Of the 38 years of political independence, the Nigerian military have been in power for 28 years, with the Civilian experimenting in a total of 10 years. The dismal failure and the causal factors which lead to our political retrogression from light to darkness was among other things the mobility of the politicians to manage the crisis of confidence arising essentially from the greed, diabolical courage in the struggle for accumulation of wealth and lack of performance by public officer holders.

A Process Evaluation of Employment Services
Presenters  Maria P Aristigueta, University of Delaware
James P Flynn, University of Delaware
Susan Keene, University of Delaware
Elena Settles, University of Delaware

Abstract  The Institute of Public Administration has been contracted by Delaware's State Personnel Office (SPO) to conduct an evaluation of its current activities and research "best practices" in non-profit human resource management. The overall project goals are to elevate SPO's partnership role with other state agencies and strengthen internal operational effectiveness by increasing efficiency, promoting programmatic realignment, and eliminating redundancies. This paper outlines the process evaluation of the decentralized division for Employment Services. The intent of the evaluation is to verify current processes and determine if services are being delivered to agency personnel and job applicants in the most efficient and effective manner. The paper will outline the methodology applied including the charting of processes and interviewing of recipients with the goals of providing feedback on the quality of the ongoing process; indicating who is receiving program services and to what extent; increasing knowledge of what program components are contributing to outcomes; identifying emerging trends and best practices in the field of employment services; and recommending necessary changes to the process.

Examining and Validating an Evaluation After the Fact
Presenters  Stephanie D Swindler, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Laura A Rowald, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Feng Cao, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Kenji Yamazaki, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Abstract  Although the management in a municipal office in a small Midwestern city was committed to the performance appraisal process, they found that their old appraisal form and procedure failed to be a user-friendly and fair system. The municipal office hired a consultant to revise the appraisal form and process, and a year later hired us to evaluate the revised form and procedures. Our evaluation focused on the revised behavioral traits, the revised rating scale, the revised procedures to minimize supervisor bias, and the increase of communication. This paper presents the evaluation of the acceptability and fairness of the revised appraisal form and procedure, and poses three specific implications to the evaluation practice including the utilization of both the formative and summative processes, the utilization of previous research to confirm the results, and the use of multiple sources for the evaluation.

Roundtables: Methods I
Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 4:20 pm.
Roundtables Session 603 to be held in the Tidewater room
Chair  To be announced

First Rotation – Table A: Thinking Like a Database: Gaining Systemic Perspective on Evaluation Design From Database Structure
Presenter  Sara Y Gittings, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning
Abstract  While databases are typically looked at simply as storage systems for data, there is much to be learned from examining the database...
developed in tandem with evaluation plans, inform the evaluation process by providing clarity: helping to reveal hidden relationships and complexities; structure: facilitating the data collection process; guidance: establishing a linear model of the evaluation; and conceptualization: identifying the common elements with a systemic perspective. As a result of this presentation, participants will have a better understanding of how the process of developing program-specific databases informs evaluation design and function.

**First Rotation – Table B: Reliability, Validity, and Feasibility of Using the Family Assessment Device (FAD) to Measure Change in Family Functioning for Consumers of Community-based Family Support Programs**

**Presenter**
Carl F Brun, Wright State University

**Abstract**
The purpose of this paper presentation is to compare the use of the Family Assessment Device (FAD) in the current study to the research findings in the literature analyzing the implementation of the same instrument. Previous uses of the FAD reported in the literature were primarily to screen persons for family treatment and/or to measure success of family treatment with dysfunctional families. In the current study, the 12 item General Family Functioning scale of the FAD was implemented in a state-wide comparison group evaluation of 38 family support programs to measure a program objective common to each of the very diverse programs: promote healthy families. The participants in this study, consumers and non-consumers, reported levels of “healthy” family communication at baseline more so than other studies reported in the literature. The implications of using the FAD to measure change in community-wide family support programs are discussed.

**First Rotation – Table C: Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis to Increase Evaluation Capacity: Lessons Learned**

**Presenters**
Liliana Rodriguez-Campos, Western Michigan University
Rigo Rincones-Gomez, Western Michigan University

**Abstract**
This paper employs a statistical methodology called confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to investigate the extent to which comparison groups share the same mental model for a particular construct being evaluated. Obviously, mental models are very important in the evaluation field, because how stakeholders perceive things will dictate how they will behave. By using CFA to test empirical data against theory, evaluators can gain valuable knowledge on how stakeholders perceive a particular construct and whether theory is consistent with stakeholders’ perceptions. The use of CFA has implications for improving the valid and reliable use of scores, and introduces a new way with which to address many of the measurement challenges inherent in the evaluation of theoretical constructs. Therefore, this paper explores the use of CFA as an important analytical tool for evaluators; hence it has value in both content and methodology.

**First Rotation – Table D: Numerical Method for Questionnaire Expert Validity**

**Presenter**
Emad Othman Alabadla, Al-quds Open University

**Abstract**
In this research we are introduced new numerical method for questionnaire Expert validity, and we can calculate validity for every questions in questionnaire, and compare new numerical method for questionnaire Expert validity with classical method of questionnaire Expert validity and we can defined the questionnaire expert reliability.

**First Rotation – Table E: Assessment: A Useful Tool for Evaluators**

**Presenters**
Ryan Watkins, George Washington University
Ingrid Guerra, University of Michigan at Dearborn

**Abstract**
Data and information are required for effective decision-making. In order for useful decisions to be made about what works, what does not, what to keep, and what to change, it is essential that such data be linked to relevant questions. Assessments, specifically, needs assessments, can be an indispensable tool for evaluators as they collect data and make useful decisions. Like evaluation, assessments are designed and implemented to answer specific questions that can be used to improve individual and organizational performance. However, the questions that assessment seeks to answer commonly have a distinct function from those of evaluation, and selecting the appropriate perspective for collecting and viewing data can be the difference between success and failure. In this session participants will learn how to apply the related, yet distinctive, perspectives of assessment and evaluation in effective organizational decision-making.

**First Rotation – Table F: The Focus Group as a Qualitative Evaluation Research Tool: Strengths and Weaknesses**

**Presenter**
David Laverny-Rafter, US General Accounting Office

**Abstract**
This paper will describe how careful design and implementation of the focus group can increase the validity and utility of this technique. Through a detailed case study of an evaluation project that employed a focus group, the paper will explain how key steps in the focus group process were implemented. The success of the focus group is based on the research questions, the focus group participants, the background material provided, the use of a professional focus group moderator to facilitate the focus group session, and accurate analysis of the transcript of the focus group session. Each of these
The purpose of this session is to discuss quality issues of NCREL's expected performance and the products we develop. To ensure high quality standards for our work, differential criteria and levels of review are employed in a quality assurance system that includes: 1) Internal and external review of projects; 2) Evaluating the value of new projects; and 3) Continuous bar-raising for quality standards. One of NCREL's products, enGauge, provides a conceptual framework that promotes and facilitates the advancement of excellence through systemic educational change. We expect high standards of quality for both our performance as well as the products we develop. To ensure high quality standards for our work, differential criteria and levels of review, quality review circles, and a review sequence are employed in a quality assurance system that includes: 1) Internal and external review of projects; 2) Evaluating the value and quality of new projects; and 3) Continuous bar-raising for quality standards.

Second Rotation - Table A: Experimental Design in the Evaluation of a Title IV-E Waiver Project

| Presenters | Colleen F Manning, Goodman Research Group Inc  
|           | Cynthia Tyska, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory  
|           | Jennifer D Dewey, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory  
|           | Nalin Johri, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
| Abstract  | The Maryland Title IV-E Waiver Project for the State of Maryland involves implementing a program for substance abusing mothers who have lost or are in danger of losing custody of a child. The women are randomly assigned to an experimental (enhanced treatment) or control (traditional) group. Those who are assigned to the control group receive the standard substance abuse treatment and family services provided from their local Department of Social Services. The women assigned to the enhanced group are referred for intervention by a team of treatment providers. This paper proposes to explore the major issues impacting the progression of Title IV-E Waiver Project and the evaluators' approach to resolving them. Such issues include but are not limited to the buy-in of front line social services workers, under reporting of substance abuse, the study referral process, access to study participants, and contamination of research design. |
Abstract The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) is a federally funded not-for-profit research and development organization that promotes and facilitates the advancement of excellence through systemic educational change. We expect high standards of quality for both our performance as well as the products we develop. To ensure high quality standards for our work, differential criteria and levels of review, quality review circles, and a review sequence are employed in a quality assurance system that includes: 1) internal and external review of projects; 2) evaluating the value and quality of new projects; and 3) continuous bar-raising for quality standards. One of NCREL’s products, enGauge, provides a conceptual framework for effective technology use in schools. The framework is built upon six essential conditions for technology integration: Vision, Effective Practice, Equity, Access, Educator Proficiency, and Systems/Leadership. Systems/Leadership is the external reflection of NCREL’s own quality assurance and evaluation processes for ongoing system monitoring and improvement. The purpose of this session is to discuss quality issues of our expected performance and our products in a holistic framework.

Second Rotation – Table F: Challenges in Evaluating Comprehensive Community-based Initiatives Across Multiple Sites
Presenter Joy Sotolongo, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Abstract Joy Sotolongo has been involved with evaluating North Carolina's comprehensive early childhood initiative, Smart Start, for seven years. The program has faced, and continues to face, challenges associated with evaluating comprehensive community-based initiatives that vary across the state. This roundtable session proposes to look at those challenges and discuss how other multi-site, community-based initiatives are addressing such issues. Questions include: What are successful techniques for educating elected officials to accept varying measures across the state for one initiative? How can evaluation results for multiple target audiences be communicated in easy to understand terms? Where does the responsibility lie for determining measurement indicators of program results? How can local determination be balanced against the information needs of state or federal funders? If you are involved with the evaluation of multi-site initiatives that involve a range of target audiences and results, please join this discussion.

Evaluating Comprehensive State and Community Changes: Taking It All On
MultiPaper Session 604 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair David M Chavis, Association for the Study and Development of Community
Discussant John Calhoun, National Crime Prevention Council
The Promises and Challenges of Systems Change Evaluations
Presenter David M Chavis, Association for the Study and Development of Community
Abstract This presentation will present the results of a review of the literature on evaluating systems changes in order to identify key conceptual and methodological issues. This presentation will provide the framework and language for the remaining presentations. It will use the design of a national effort to institutionalize prevention as the preferred strategy for addressing social and health problems in six states to illustrate the conceptual framework. The presentation will discuss issues related to the change process, the orders (or phases) of change that occur as changes in policies and practices become institutionalized, and the multiple levels that need to be measured in order to assess the impact of the change process. The presentation will conclude with the methodological challenges that face these evaluations. The remaining time will be used for questions and discussion by the audience.

Evaluating Transformative Community Change
Presenter Pennie G Foster-Fishman, Michigan State University

Outcomes of State systems Change Efforts: Immediate Results, Future Plans
Presenter Delbert J Ervin, Association for the Study and Development of Community

Evaluating the Readiness and Capacity to Change
Presenters Jill Hunter-Williams, Association for the Study and Development of Community
           David M Chavis, Association for the Study and Development of Community

Improving Evaluation Use Through Knowledge Management
Demonstration Session 605 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG
Chair Patrick G Grasso, The World Bank
Presenters Rema Balasundaram, The World Bank
       Patricia Laverley, The World Bank
Modern Measurement: A Key to Successful Evaluation
Panel Session 606 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair Kendon J. Conrad, University of Illinois at Chicago

Session Abstract This is an exciting time in social science measurement. New rules exist of which many social scientists, including evaluators, may not be aware. New tools are available to provide insights into our measures so that we can use existing measures more efficiently. This panel is designed to introduce some of the new rules and the new tools that evaluators can use. The panel assumes that measurement matters in evaluation. It demonstrates solutions to common measurement issues in evaluation. Topics include: What if no truly appropriate measure of the key construct can be found? Can you improve an existing measure during an evaluation? How can you shorten a measure that’s too long for your purposes? What are reasonable standards of reliability? What are reasonable standards of validity? Can you discover items that don’t work and may diminish your ability to estimate results validly? What is the role of program theory in measurement?

Modern Measurement Theory and Its Relevance to Program Evaluation
Presenter Patrick McKnight, University of Arizona

Abstract Measurement moderates program evaluation outcomes. Better measures are more likely to produce more meaningful and interpretable results. Moreover, results are more likely to show the true effects of the program. If measurement is so vital to program evaluation, then improving measurement ought to be in the forefront of most evaluators goals. Unfortunately, measurement is often an afterthought and errors in measurement only become evident after data collection. Modern measurement theory offers many tools to help evaluators improve measurement and communicate these improvements to other evaluators. The following presentation discusses two research projects where the application of modern measurement theory tools has led to dramatic changes in program evaluation and future policy. These projects include the national evaluation of blind rehabilitation services and a research project on attitude measurement.

Measurement in Evaluation Or Is It Evolution? Creating a New Measure
Presenter Kendon J. Conrad, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract Money management is a key component of life that can be especially problematic for persons with disabling conditions. In an evaluation of a money management program for persons with severe mental illness, no appropriate measure of money management disability could be found. An initial attempt to measure this construct was developed through literature review, focus groups with a variety of stakeholders including clients and treatment staff, and review by an expert panel. With this input, a theoretical model, a.k.a., logic model, was developed to guide item construction. The logic model posited the need factors, the intervention types, and the most direct expected outcomes of money management, i.e., disabilities or difficulties in handling one’s money to pay for the basic necessities of life. Items were tested, revised, added and rejected in three waves of data collection at baseline, six and twelve months. The first and second wave items were revised or replaced with new items based on item diagnostics, input from the interviewers, and ongoing discoveries of relevant literature. The statistical analyses consisted of assessments of: 1) construct dimensionality using factor analysis; 2) internal consistency reliability using Cronbach’s alpha; 3) appropriateness for the target population using Rasch analysis; 4) item diagnostics using Rasch analysis; and 5) construct validity by testing hypothesized relationships. The resulting Financial Disability and Victimization Questionnaire consisted of 22 items comprising two subscales. Using the subscales together produced a reliable (alpha = .87) and valid assessment of the intended construct. Therefore, the questionnaire served as a key outcome measure for the evaluation.

Housing Quality Questionnaire: Evaluation of Housing Quality for Veterans Affairs Patients with Severe Mental Illness
Presenter Edward Clark, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract The purpose of this paper was to analyze how the Housing Quality Questionnaire (HQQ) measured the housing quality for persons who received federal subsidized funding, and who were dually diagnosed with Mental Illness and Substance Abuse (MISA) disorders. The HQQ included 29 items adapted from the housing quality section of the American Housing Survey. A summary score range between zero
and eighty-seven was totaled for the HQQ, with higher scores equaling inadequate or poor housing quality. The sample population included 120 United States Veterans who relied on Veteran and/or Social Security benefits as their main sources of income. In addition, these subjects suffered from MISA disorders and were currently living in the institutionalized setting of a psychiatric hospital with subsequent discharge to the community. All persons were included in the study because their MISA conditions placed them at high risk for inadequate housing or homelessness. The HQQ is a new measure developed for this evaluation. Analysis focused on Rasch techniques using the Rating Scale model.

The Measurement of Work Load in an Evaluation of a Firefighter Physical Fitness Intervention

Presenters: Karen M Conrad, University of Illinois at Chicago
Kendon J Conrad, University of Illinois at Chicago
Paul A Reichelt, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract: Perception of workload was a critical time-varying covariate in an evaluation of a worksite physical fitness intervention on resistance to work-related fatigue among firefighter/paramedics. Using an ecologically based conceptual framework and a quasi-experimental study design with switching replications, 21 non-exercising firefighter/paramedics participated in a 12-week fitness intervention program. Firefighters’ day-to-day variation in their perceptions of workload was measured using the NASA-TLX (Task Load Index) developed by Hart and Staveland. The NASA-TLX consists of 6 items. The six workload dimensions rated on a 10-point scale are mental demand, physical demand, time pressure, performance level, frustration level, and physical and mental effort exerted. Identifying a particularly demanding job task, each firefighter was asked to complete the TLX using a computer screen three times per shift over a 12-week intervention period. Over this period, 871 entries were recorded. This presentation will report on how Rasch analysis was used to develop a hierarchy of job tasks. A discussion of how the hierarchy addressed the critical issue of task intensity and work load is presented.
Abstract In response to the problem of declining student SAT scores, the Prince George’s County Public School System has implemented an SAT Preparatory Intervention Program. The program includes a number of strategies to help improve the overall SAT performance of county students. A formative evaluation was conducted to determine the extent to which the program has been implemented according to the program’s design at the various schools. This paper describes the formative evaluation design and process. A multi-method design is used which includes interviews, document reviews, observations, surveys, and focus groups. The paper begins with a description of program features, followed by the evaluation questions. Next, the evaluation methodology is presented. Then, the evaluation results are described, followed by a discussion of data collection and program implementation issues. The concluding section describes how the evaluation findings have implications for both educational policy and the future evaluation activities in this area.

Evaluation of High School Magnet Programs: A Summative Approach

Presenters Shahpar Modarresi, Prince George's County Public Schools
Eugene P Adcock, Prince George's County Public Schools

Abstract This study details the summative evaluation of nine high school magnet programs in the Prince George’s County Public School System. Each of the nine magnet programs subscribes to a particular educational philosophy or curricular specialty. The school system’s essential curriculum is included in the magnet programs, along with a range of special or unique features. This paper begins by describing the nine magnet programs currently operating in the school system, followed by the evaluation questions. Next, the methodology, including evaluation design, comparison school selection criteria, evaluation instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures, is described. The evaluation results will then be presented, followed by a discussion of the implications of the findings for program improvement, future planning, and policy development. The concluding section will include a discussion of the issues and challenges involved in the evaluation of magnet programs and offer recommendations for future evaluation activities in this area.

Evaluating Parameters for Success in a High Stakes Evaluation Environment

Presenters Paul Lorton Jr, University of San Francisco
Devida Desmond, San Francisco Unified School District
Lisa Wichser, Roosevelt Middle School
Joanna Fong, Roosevelt Middle School

Abstract The Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) program in California is a paragon of a high stakes evaluation effort. It is a model and a bane, a hope and a tragedy. It can also be a great teacher and, by looking at its impact and results in the identified schools of the San Francisco Unified School district, we will illustrate the greatness it seeks and how close to that goal it has come with its first graduating class. For all schools in the district there is an elaborate data trail with significant narrative and quantitative information on each school. By evaluating such data on each identified school both that which has been formally maintained and that which exists in the institutional memory of the organization, we will identify the key strengths and significant achievements of the program as well as castigate the less worthy accomplishments of this extensive and Draconian effort.

Murphy’s Law of Evaluation: Nimbleness as an Evaluator Competency

Think Tank Session 609 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG
Facilitators Dawn Hanson Smart, The Evaluation Forum
Judith Clegg, Clegg & Associates

Abstract What can go wrong in an evaluation, often does. How do you adapt? And how do you do it rapidly enough to carry out the evaluation in the time you have available? At each stage in an evaluation - scoping and design, instrument development, implementation, data preparation and analysis, and reporting - a myriad of problems can arise. In order to cope with these realities, an evaluator must be nimble - a combination of flexible, quick and resourceful in order to respond and complete a rigorous, high quality evaluation. This think tank will provide participants the chance to hear about the problems that arise, share their own ‘disaster’ experiences, and discuss in small groups the options that might be put in place to counteract the inevitable challenges that every evaluator faces. Come prepared for some fun, some honest, open discussion and the chance to share your ideas and solutions with others.

Retrospective Pretest Methods in Practice: Four Examples

Panel Session 610 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG
Chair Jennifer W Martineau, Center for Creative Leadership
Session Abstract One of the oldest questions in behavioral sciences fields, including evaluation, is how to measure whether change has occurred. There
have been many attempts to address this question -- some with quite fruitful outcomes. Modeling change statistically is one of the most accurate methods, for example. However, many of these statistically accurate techniques don't adequately meet all of the needs that arise in practice with regard to measuring change. This session will focus on the use of retrospective pretest measures in practice, building an understanding of how this method has contributed to the measurement of change in real-world settings (as opposed to strict research studies). The need to measure change is real, and the problems associated with traditional pre-post methodologies have been mitigated, at least to some extent, by the use of retrospective pretests. This session will allow evaluators to share their experiences and learnings related to the use of this method.

When You Don't Know What You Don't Know: Evaluating Workshops and Training Sessions Using the Retrospective Pretest Method

Presenter: Kathleen B Lynch, Virginia Institute for Developmental Disabilities

Abstract: One of the challenges that regularly faces an evaluator charged with assisting practitioners to assess the effectiveness of workshops and training sessions is how to create practical, low-cost, yet useful, evaluation tools. When the goal of a workshop or training session is to deliver new information to participants, the evaluation task becomes: how can we measure knowledge gain? The use of traditional pre-post knowledge tests is problematic for several reasons. Two in particular that surface in the real world of training and technical assistance are the non-comparability of the pre- and post-groups (e.g., caused by late arrivers, early leavers) and the cost of developing instruments that are sufficiently sensitive to detect small gains in knowledge. A solution that will be presented is the use of a retrospective pre-post self-assessment of level of knowledge. Examples of different formats for questions and use of this method in different disciplines will be shared.

Measuring Psychotherapy Program Effectiveness with a Retrospective Measure: Incorporating an Observer Report

Presenters: Scott Davies, American Institutes for Research; James Bargar, Missouri Western State College

Abstract: This paper describes the development and program implementation of a global measure of psychotherapy effectiveness. The measurement model included present/retrospective self-reports and present/retrospective observer reports. While retrospective reports are often criticized, they must be taken seriously if robust change is reported, unless the client is deemed delusional (Strupp, 1996). Observer reports were included as validation to the present and retrospective self-reports. A brief, reliable measure (the GSPE) was developed and validated through a series of studies. Initial program implementation included forty-four outpatients. Robust positive changes in clientsÆ global functioning were reported by clients, with a high level of agreement from observers. The utility of present and retrospective self-reports, particularly when combined with observer reports, will be discussed.

The Leadership Development Challenge: Measuring Change Using Retrospective Methods

Presenter: Jennifer W Martineau, Center for Creative Leadership

Abstract: Measuring change has long been a challenge for the Center for Creative Leadership. Because our *subjects" are actually tuition-paying managers and executives who, although appreciative of the value of the Center's research foundation to their own leadership development, do not relish being considered "data providers" rather than "data recipients". Therefore, one of the values to which we abide is that any data collected from our participants will also provide feedback to them. In the case of measuring change as a result of leadership development programs, we have opted to create a 360-degree retrospective methodology-based feedback instrument. An individual receives his or her data in the form of a developmental feedback report. Aggregate reports are provided to CCL internal and external clients as a way of providing evidence of impact. This presentation will highlight the design and outcomes of this instrument, as well as what we have learned about it and its use.

The Program-based Outcome Evaluation: Using Retrospective Methods to Facilitate Training and Capture Systemic Information

Presenters: Morgan Lyons, Lodestar Management Research Incorporated; Maura Harrington, Lodestar Management/Research Inc

Abstract: The Program-based Outcome Evaluation (POE) model was created by Lodestar Management/Research and Big Brother Big Sisters of America (BBBSA) in 1997-98 and has been adopted by a number of sites and several mentoring research projects. POE's purpose is two-fold: 1) to facilitate the training/supervision of volunteer mentors, and 2) to capture systematic information from mentors, parents, teachers and supervisors, about key developmental outcomes. It assists both research and programming in that it 1) is essentially non-intrusive to the mentoring relationship; 2) is a means to get adequate information on sensitive topics (i.e., delinquency); 3) reinforces the goals of the match; and 4) gives the volunteer, youth and supervisor feedback about match accomplishments and needs. The discussion examines data collected across types of programs and observers, as well as test-retest and Ôhard dataö alternatives. It also examines POE as a research tool, as opposed to a training or management tool.
TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Evaluating Educational Programs in the Context of Shifting Paradigms

Business Meeting Session 611 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG

TIG Leaders
Tom Grayson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Howard Mzumara, Indiana University Purdue University

Discussant
Robert E Stake, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Presenters
Kevin P Saunders, Iowa State University
Mary E Huba, Iowa State University

Session Abstract
Two engineering departments at a research university were awarded grants to develop problem-based curricula leading to learning outcomes required by professional accreditation. In each, an education faculty member and graduate student were included as goal-based evaluators. Evaluation plans were developed within an outcomes-based educational framework, including both quantitative (e.g., surveys) and qualitative (e.g., focus groups, rubrics) methodologies. The qualitative methodologies, while compatible with project goals, were unfamiliar to faculty stakeholders in both departments. In one, unfamiliarity led to their discomfort with the evaluation. In the other, their unfamiliarity sparked a desire for learning and established the evaluation as a central element of project implementation. Because of these contrasting reactions, the evaluators incorporated elements of responsive and expertise-oriented approaches into the evaluation of each project. This paper discusses implications of evaluating a program in which program staff unwittingly design an intervention incompatible with their underlying beliefs, values, and assumptions about education.

Teaching of Evaluation TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 612 to be held in Ballroom B
Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders
Katye M Perry, Oklahoma State University
Sarita Davis, Clark Atlanta University

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Using Culturally-sensitive Evaluation to Refine and Improve a Culturally-based Health Promotion Program for Latino Men

Business Meeting Session 613 to be held in the Washington A room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders
Carol Torok, State University of New York Institute of Technology
Jacob Silver, Huron Mountain Research Services
Heather Becker, University of Texas
Summers Kalishman, University of New Mexico

Presenters
Ross F Conner, University of California at Irvine
Lois M Takahashi, University of California at Los Angeles
George Avila, University of California at Irvine

Session Abstract
Proyecto S.O.L.A.A.R. (Superacion, Orgullo y Lucha Atraves de Amor en Relaciones; Empowerment, Pride and Struggle through Love in Relationships) uses intensive retreats with small groups of Latino-identified gay/bisexual men to reduce HIV risk. Due to the cultural realities of these men, who live with the pressures and mixed messages of two cultures (Latino and Anglo), the program creators developed an HIV-prevention program that focuses less on HIV education and more on the cultural conflicts and misunderstandings these men face in establishing healthy dating and personal relationships. Working collaboratively with the program team, we developed and implemented a culturally-sensitive evaluation to complement the program. We will discuss the evaluation plan and measures and highlight how formative evaluation results were used for refinements and improvements. We will explain how, through the evaluation activities, the need to recruit more participants was identified, and a social marketing component was added, using multiculturally-sensitive methods.
The Role of the "What Works" Clearinghouse in Creating an Evidence-based Education System

Expert Lecture Session 614 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair      Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University
Discussant Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University
Speaker    Harris Cooper, University of Missouri
Abstract   A consistent and significant theme of current U.S. Department of Education policy is that rigorous impact evaluations of the effectiveness of replicable products, programs, and practices are needed to make education a more scientifically based field that will advance high quality service provision and student learning. Dr. Martin Orland, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Research and Improvement, will outline the rationale for this perspective and describe one major outgrowth from it: the "What Works" Clearinghouse. He will describe how ED will use the Clearinghouse to:
1) develop rigorous, systematic evidence standards for assessing the effectiveness of potentially replicable educational interventions; 2) obtain, analyze, and report on the nature and strength of evidence to support claims of positive impact on a wide range of education interventions and share it with educational practitioners and policymakers; and 3) increase the capacity of educators and evaluators to develop and use this type of evidence wisely.

Social Work TIG Business Meeting
Business Meeting Session 615 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Social Work and the Human Services Evaluation TIG
TIG Leaders Mansoor AF Kazi, University of Huddersfield
             Bruce Thyer, Florida State University
             Kathleen Bolland, University of Alabama
             Robert L Fischer, Case Western Reserve University

Compromises and Casualties: Independent Female Evaluators in Care-giving Roles
Panel Session 616 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG and the Independent Consulting TIG
Chair      Tristi C Nichols, Manitou Inc
Discussant Denice A Cassaro, Cornell University
Presenters Tristi C Nichols, Manitou Inc
            Bowen Kathryn, Bowen's Evaluation & Consulting Service Inc
Session Abstract The aim of the paper presentation is to describe our experiences as independent evaluators with businesses of our own, and the different avenues we have explored to cultivate business opportunities as parents. We examine how the issues of gender, race, class and motherhood, in particular, influence the process of business development and operations. The first author, an African-American female working in international contexts, describes how her role as an evaluator has undergone significant change since the arrival of her new daughter. With the presence of a baby, professional travels had to be modified, thereby suppressing opportunities to be immersed in different cultures. It is doubtful that evaluators not in care-giving roles under similar circumstances would be willing to interrupt his/her career ambitions. The second author outlines how the care-giving role that women often assume impacts greatly on the flexibility and opportunities that are available to the independent evaluator. Women are more likely to go to great lengths to care for family to include their children, parents and siblings. This has significant implications for the female evaluator who is managing an evaluation business, maintaining the quality of her work, and marketing herself to clients who are empathetic and sensitive to the role of care-givers (e.g., adolescent pregnancy prevention and nutrition education programs). Our presentation will conclude with reflections about how changing roles within gender (from female to mother), class (the illusion of affluence) affect the practice of evaluation.

Human Services TIG Business Meeting
Business Meeting Session 617 to be held in the Potomac III room
Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG Business Meeting
Business Meeting Session 618 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
TIG Leaders
Hazel Symonette, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Ivy Jones Turner, National Tenpoint Leadership Foundation
James Earl Davis, Temple University

Participatory Reflection for Program Improvement in Graduate Education: Can Faculty, Students and Administrators Talk?
Think Tank Session 619 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Presenters
Betsy Crane, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Susan Boser, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Barbara A Feroz, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Tina Fitzpatrick, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Melanie B Grant, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Abstract
In academia, participatory reflection for program improvement presents special challenges. Curriculum may be seen as the exclusive province of faculty, even of individual faculty. While the knowledge and perspectives of students and administration can be very useful, is it opening up a can of worms to attempt a collaborative inquiry among all stakeholders? This think tank session will focus on how to construct and support a process whereby faculty, graduate students and administrators can have input on and share perspectives on program strengths and challenges, as well as developing suggestions for program improvement. A research team of faculty and students will present a case example of such a process used to reflect on a doctoral education program at a state university. Participants will then share experiences and perspectives on the possibilities and promises of participatory reflection in academia.

Participatory Action Research to Evaluate Community-based Systems of Care for Children with Special Health Care Needs
Panel Session 620 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG
Chair
Diane D Behl, Utah State University
Discussant
Richard N Roberts, Utah State University
Session Abstract
This panel will present two 4-year studies that evaluated the Healthy People 2010 outcome ‘to ensure a system of care for children with special health care needs (CSPHCN) and their families.* Both used a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach to guide the design, methods, measures, and interpretation of findings for each study. The Measuring and Monitoring (M&M) project focused on state-level efforts to monitor, report, and guide state-level program improvement within 6 states. The Opening Doors into Rural Communities (ODRC) project used a PAR approach with four communities to better integrate services to meet the needs of young children with special needs and their families. This session will emphasize the importance of using a PAR approach, particularly the involvement of families as stakeholders. The process used to operationalize the definition of a ‘system of careö as well as develop methods and tools to evaluate the service system will be discussed.
Evaluating Community-level Service Integration Efforts
Abstract: The Opening Doors into Rural Communities Project (ODRC) designed a model of PAR and technical assistance for assisting communities to integrate public and private services into a comprehensive, coordinated system of care for young children with special needs and their families. The interagency councils in four communities worked to create more integrated systems of care using strategies, such as coordinating early intervention with the medical home; developing a joint application process; and co-locating public and private services and resources. This session will present the PAR evaluation model used and describe four participatory evaluation tools designed to help communities assess their own assets and challenges to improved service integration. The outcomes of each community's efforts will be described. In addition, a series of necessary ingredients for successful interagency teams will be shared with the participants.

Measuring and Monitoring Outcomes for Children with Special Health Care Needs

Abstract: The Measuring & Monitoring Systems of Care Project (M&M) is a federally-funded evaluation effort to develop indicators and feasible strategies for states to measure their achievements of the performance outcomes for children with special health care needs (CShCN) which are promoted in Healthy People 2010. The PAR approach used involved collaboration with stakeholders in 6 states, with participation from state departments, such as health, education, developmental disabilities, as well as family representatives and private providers. This session will discuss the outcomes that are to be achieved for children with special health care needs, including children with disabilities. The consensus process used to develop indicators for these outcomes and the evaluation strategies developed to enhance state measurement capacity will be shared. The importance of diverse stakeholder involvement, particularly families, will be emphasized. The process used by states to improve their measurement capacity will be outlined, along with recommendations for evaluators who are facilitating such efforts.

Environmental Program Evaluation TIG Business Meeting

Business Meeting Session 621 to be held in the Conference Theater room

Sponsored by the Environmental Program Evaluation TIG

TIG Leaders
Elizabeth H Danter, The Ohio State University
Eric J Mundy, University of Akron
Katherine A Dawes, US Environmental Protection Agency
Jean Haley, Haley-McGuiness Consulting Group

Roundtables: Public Sector

Roundtables Session 622 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair Deborah G Bonnet, Lumina Foundation for Education

Table A: Mainstreaming Evaluation Use Through Community-based Data Utilization Technical Assistance

Presenter Scott WM Burrus, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc

Abstract: By providing meaningful and applicable technical assistance around data interpretation and utilization, community groups gain increased interest and competency around the application of data for their program planning and evaluation. Technical assistance training empowers users to understand and use data in their work thereby facilitating everyday use. At this roundtable, Scott W.M. Burrus, Project Coordinator for NPC Research, Inc., will explain how they use technical assistance training to increase evaluation use. After this brief explanation, a facilitated discussion on providing technical assistance in communities will consume the remainder of the roundtable session.

Table B: Evaluation in Federal and State Agencies: A Comparison of Tools, Constraints, and Impacts

Presenters Lucie L Vogel, US Department of Agriculture
Jane Roth, US Department of Agriculture
Elizabeth Smith, Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services
Myra Owens, Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services
Table C: Investigating the State of the Art in Evaluating Sustainable Development in the United States, Europe and Worldwide

| Presenters     | Okechukwu M Ukaga, University of Minnesota |
|               | C Gerlinde Struhkamp, University of Minnesota |

Table D: The Challenges of Implementing an Outcome Evaluation System for Measuring the Impact of Library Services

| Presenters                          | Cherie D McCraw, Florida Division of Library and Information Services |
|                                   | Linda B Schrader, Florida State University |
|                                   | Karen Motylewski, Institute of Museum and Library Services |

Table E: Using Evaluation to Provide Systematic Feedback to Court Systems: The Family Index Evaluation Project as a Case Study

| Presenters                        | Katrina L Bledsoe, The College of New Jersey |
|                                   | Ryan Quist, Claremont Graduate University |
|                                   | Stewart I Donaldson, Claremont Graduate University |

Table F: Defining Culture Holistically: Constraints and Findings on Visitor Profiles

| Presenters                        | Sunita C Hilton, The Ohio State University |
|                                   | Joe E Heimlich, The Ohio State University |

Abstract: Attendees of this roundtable are invited to share their interest and knowledge about sustainable development and how this holistic concept can possibly be evaluated. The presenters, a German citizen who is currently an international student in the U.S. and an American citizen of African descent, bring forward experiences and recent developments from a European Conference and Research Project on this topic that they both are involved in. This roundtable is supposed to serve for networking among the national and international attendees of the AEA conference who are interested in the concept of sustainability and its evaluation. The purposeful aim of this roundtable is an open discussion and sharing of knowledge—it should rather be thought of as a "think tank" than a presentation.
Demonstration Session 623 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair: Pamela Goodman, Baptist Community Ministries
Presenters: Barry M Kibel, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
Pamela Goodman, Baptist Community Ministries
Abstract: Each funding cycle, grant-makers are faced with hard choices. How best to allocate the funds at their disposal? Which types of projects or initiatives to support and at what levels and for how long? Should projects addressing immediate needs take precedence over those with less immediate impact but which hold promise for sustained community contributions over an extended time frame? The presenters have devised a conceptual framework and supporting algorithm to help answer questions such as these. The framework/algorithm can be used by foundation grant-makers to (a) examine the impact and contributions of individual grants, (b) examine the impact and contributions of clusters of grants within or across zones, and (c) engage in simulation exercises to determine the type and scale of grants to consider for funding with the highest likelihood of contributing to, and catalyzing, macroscale change.

Science and Technology Indicators for Cost-benefit Analysis
Expert Lecture Session 624 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: Nicholas S Vonortas, George Washington University
Speakers: Nicholas S Vonortas, George Washington University
Joseph Cordes, George Washington University
Abstract: This session will be divided into two parts. The first part will lay out recent developments in building new quantitative indicators relevant to science, technology and innovation. Emphasis will be placed on the measurement of processes and capabilities through new innovation network indicators. The second part will place the discussion on indicators in the context of cost-benefit analysis as tool for evaluating research and development programs. The discussion will focus on the defining and measuring the social benefits of research and development, as well as on ways of incorporating uncertainty about the effects of R&D spending in benefit-cost evaluations.

Understanding the Use of Trend Analysis in Program Evaluation
Think Tank Session 625 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Facilitators: Andrew K Rudd, Indiana University
Joe B Hansen, Western Oregon University
Abstract: Recently we were charged with conducting a four-year ‘trend analysis’ on academic achievement data in relationship to an after-school program. Stakeholders of the program wanted to know if an upward trend in academic achievement could be seen as a result of the program. The assessment data were from three different standardized testing systems (all on a similar scale) for grades 3-8. We realized that there are multiple ways for examining a ‘trend.’ Therefore we exhaustively explored the use of four different methods of analyzing the data. After consulting the literature on trend analysis and after our own trend analysis experience we believe that more clarity needs to be brought to the concept of trend analysis. The purpose of our presentation then is to pose the following question: How should one go about analyzing a trend?

Evaluation of Development Evaluation Training
Panel Session 626 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair: Patrick G Grasso, The World Bank
Session Abstract: A major theme of current development work is building capacity in developing countries. This panel examines evaluation training programs sponsored by the World Bank aimed at development organizations and developing country governments to improve their ability to conduct evaluations. The programs use different modalities to deliver training: a residential program and distance learning via teleconference. Each of the programs also includes an evaluation component. Presenters on this panel will describe the programs and discuss both the content and delivery mechanisms. A major feature of the presentations will how the programs are evaluated, and what use is made of evaluation results in modifying or refining the training.
Using "Ideawriting" in Evaluation: A Demonstration and Skill Building Opportunity

Skill-building Workshop Session 628 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG
Chair Vicki M Staebler Tardino, Saint Louis University
Presenters Stephanie D Swindler, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Jennifer D Dewey, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Abstract "Ideawriting" (see Carl Moore, 1994) is an easy-to-learn group technique for developing ideas and exploring their meaning that has numerous applications in evaluation research and practice. The technique capitalizes on both individual contributions and group interaction, and can be used in conjunction with other qualitative and quantitative methods in the development of ideas or plans. This skill building workshop will provide a conceptual overview of 1) advantages and disadvantages, 2) steps in facilitating an ideawriting session, 3) potential applications, and 4) examples of how ideawriting has been used in recent research and practice. Then, using the agenda of the 2002 Conference Evaluation Team or other AEA entity as a springboard for inquiry, participants will facilitate and engage in a real-time ideawriting session. The data that result will be donated to the 2002 Conference Evaluation Team at the conclusion of the session.
**Business and Industry TIG Business Meeting**

Business Meeting Session 629 to be held in the Prince William room  
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG  
TIG Leaders  
E Jane Davidson, Western Michigan University  
Darryl L Jinkerson, Abilene Christian University  
Jennifer W Martineau, Center for Creative Leadership  
Kelly Hannum, Center for Creative Leadership

---

**Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG Business Meeting**

Business Meeting Session 630 to be held in the Board room  
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG  
TIG Leaders  
Robert G Orwin, Westat  
Scott B Crosse, Westat

---

**Evening Event: Friday, November 8, 2002 – 6:30 pm to 7:45 pm**

**Special Event**

**Silent Auction and Evening Reception**  
Auction and Reception Session 631 to be held in the Regency Ballroom  
Generously sponsored by The World Bank  
Hosts  
International and Cross-cultural Topical Interest Group

Proceeds from the silent auction go to a travel scholarship fund for evaluators from developing countries. We encourage you to attend the auction and consider bidding on one of the many items from around the world or a signed book from a noted AEA author. Donations of any type are welcome and may be turned in upon conference check-in at the AEA registration desk.
Coffee and Tea Break: Coffee and tea are available on the main conference floor outside the ballrooms before and after the first session of the day.

Conference Sessions: Saturday, November 9, 2002 – 8:00 am to 9:30 am

Presidential Strand

Who Are We? The Internal Evaluator Within a Larger System
Think Tank Session 700 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand
Facilitator: Ben Kerman, Casey Family Services
Presenters: Kathleen Lenerz, Casey Family Services
Martha Morrison Dore, Casey Family Services
Bonnie Kerker, Casey Family Services
Amy Stephens, Casey Family Services
Abstract: The identity of an internal evaluator or department reflects both the underlying mission for evaluation within an organization and the evaluator's self-definition of purpose. This sense of "evaluation identity" is important because it helps evaluators set priorities for research efforts, organize work activities, and adapt to changing conditions within and beyond the organization. Because evaluation departments can assume many forms, depending on multiple systemic factors, role ambiguity can result. This can be a pitfall when contending with the shifting priorities and contexts within any system. The effort to form and maintain an "evaluation identity" poses long-term developmental challenges involving self-definition, stakeholder definition, and integrating the evaluation mission and functions into the organizational structure. This Think Tank explores the range of strategies and activities that can facilitate the establishment and maintenance of an "evaluation identity." Discussion questions will explore methods for maintaining a stable identity while flexibly responding to organizational change.

Conference Committee Strand

Transformation in Government: Challenges for Program Evaluation
Expert Lecture Session 702 to be held in Ballroom C
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Chair: Nancy R Kingsbury, US General Accounting Office
Speaker: David M Walker, US General Accounting Office
Abstract: Government is on a "burning platform", and the status quo way of doing business cannot be sustained for a variety of reasons including rising public expectations for demonstrable results and enhanced responsiveness, fiscal and societal trends that present huge challenges, and additional resource demands arising from the war on terrorism. Important questions need to be faced, including debating what the government (at many levels) does and should do, and how to achieve government transformation for the 21st century. What activities must government continue to perform? What tools of governance are available to transform the way government does business? What can program evaluators contribute to this important debate?

TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions

Inter-environmental Evaluation of Technology Supported Learning
MultiPaper Session 701 to be held in Ballroom B
Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG
Chair: Roger J D Chesswas, WestEd
Technology Support Solutions for Rural Schools: Evaluand Profile and Evaluation Practice
Presenter: Mark Hawkes, Dakota State University
Abstract: As a part of their programs for education reform and opportunity, rural schools are applying desktop and telecommunications technology with increasingly frequency. The use of these technologies requires extensive maintenance and training. However, an era of downsizing and budget cuts leaves rural schools wondering how they can best support the use of educational technologies in their schools. This presentation will recount how a practice-based solution was wrought through evaluation activities to determine how to best support rural school technology support needs. Ideas and data shared leads to a discussion of systemic and systematic support for this struggling segment of our school system.

Teaching Medical Students at a Distance Using Distance Learning Benchmarks to Plan and Evaluate an Online Medical Student Curriculum

Presenters: Cynthia A Olney, University of Texas at San Antonio
           Heidi Chumley Jones, University of Texas at San Antonio
           Juan M Parra, University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract: In June 2002, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio (UTHSCSA) will send third-year medical students 279 miles from main campus to complete an integrated primary care clerkship at the Regional Academic Health Center. To meet some unique challenges of this distance-learning situation, the web-based Virtual Community curriculum was developed to supplement the didactic component of the clerkship. Students will complete Virtual Community modules online, then meet for face-to-face group discussions led by faculty facilitators. We used the distance learning quality benchmarks published by the Institute for Higher Education Policy in our planning of the Virtual Community curriculum. Current Internet distance learning guidelines are untested in medical education and the field lacks specific instruments to assess the benchmarks. In this presentation, we will describe our application of the benchmarks and present examples of the tools we developed to assess the standards.

Informing the Reform Process: An Evaluation Model for a Digital Library Services Tool

Presenters: Derek R Reinke, Utah State University
            Jim Dorward, Utah State University

Abstract: Substantial federal funding has supported the creation of digital libraries for education. A primary goal of these libraries is to provide users a way to discover digital learning resources. Toward this goal, a team at one university is currently developing a container environment that enables users to discover, select, reuse, sequence, and annotate these digital resources. This paper describes the evaluation efforts connected to this development project. The evaluation approach was modeled after Patton’s description of developmental evaluation, and included a needs assessment, expert review of software interface, prototype testing by members of the target audience, analysis of code changes by constituents, a case study of master teacher use of software, and a summative evaluation to assess overall product utility. By documenting our rapid-prototyping, iterative, and user-centered approach for evaluating a digital library service, we provide a set of methods that other evaluators may wish to employ.

Results Frameworks for Research: Canadian, New Zealand, and United States Approaches to Government Accountability

MultiPaper Session 703 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Recent Changes to Evaluation and Performance Measurement in Canadian Research, Development and Technology Programs

Presenter: George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Abstract: There have been a number of recent changes to formalizing and institutionalizing requirements for performance measurement and reporting in evaluation in the Canadian federal government. This paper will provide an overview of the current situation, with examples from R&D and innovation related programs. This will be an opportunity to compare the Canadian approach to that in the U.S. under GPRA.

Developing a Performance Measurement and Reporting Strategy for Defense Research and Development

Presenters: Steven Hughes, Defense R&D Canada
            George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Abstract: The Research and Development arm of the Canadian Department of National Defence has recently become a separate operating agency, known as Defence R&D Canada. With this change has come a requirement to develop an appropriate performance measurement and reporting strategy, to describe the extent to which the organization is implementing the strategic plan, working with the intended collaborators, reaching the right clients and achieving the outcomes and impacts identified in the business plan. This paper will present recent work by the authors in facilitating the development of a practical approach and building awareness and support among managers in the organization and in the Canadian Department of National Defence.

Evaluation of the New "Growing an Innovative New Zealand" Framework

MultiPaper Session 704 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Abstract: The Research and Development arm of the Canadian Department of National Defence has recently become a separate operating agency, known as Defence R&D Canada. With this change has come a requirement to develop an appropriate performance measurement and reporting strategy, to describe the extent to which the organization is implementing the strategic plan, working with the intended collaborators, reaching the right clients and achieving the outcomes and impacts identified in the business plan. This paper will present recent work by the authors in facilitating the development of a practical approach and building awareness and support among managers in the organization and in the Canadian Department of National Defence.

Informing the Reform Process: An Evaluation Model for a Digital Library Services Tool

Presenters: Derek R Reinke, Utah State University
            Jim Dorward, Utah State University

Abstract: Substantial federal funding has supported the creation of digital libraries for education. A primary goal of these libraries is to provide users a way to discover digital learning resources. Toward this goal, a team at one university is currently developing a container environment that enables users to discover, select, reuse, sequence, and annotate these digital resources. This paper describes the evaluation efforts connected to this development project. The evaluation approach was modeled after Patton’s description of developmental evaluation, and included a needs assessment, expert review of software interface, prototype testing by members of the target audience, analysis of code changes by constituents, a case study of master teacher use of software, and a summative evaluation to assess overall product utility. By documenting our rapid-prototyping, iterative, and user-centered approach for evaluating a digital library service, we provide a set of methods that other evaluators may wish to employ.

Results Frameworks for Research: Canadian, New Zealand, and United States Approaches to Government Accountability

MultiPaper Session 703 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Recent Changes to Evaluation and Performance Measurement in Canadian Research, Development and Technology Programs

Presenter: George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Abstract: There have been a number of recent changes to formalizing and institutionalizing requirements for performance measurement and reporting in evaluation in the Canadian federal government. This paper will provide an overview of the current situation, with examples from R&D and innovation related programs. This will be an opportunity to compare the Canadian approach to that in the U.S. under GPRA.

Developing a Performance Measurement and Reporting Strategy for Defense Research and Development

Presenters: Steven Hughes, Defense R&D Canada
            George G Teather, Independent Consultant

Abstract: The Research and Development arm of the Canadian Department of National Defence has recently become a separate operating agency, known as Defence R&D Canada. With this change has come a requirement to develop an appropriate performance measurement and reporting strategy, to describe the extent to which the organization is implementing the strategic plan, working with the intended collaborators, reaching the right clients and achieving the outcomes and impacts identified in the business plan. This paper will present recent work by the authors in facilitating the development of a practical approach and building awareness and support among managers in the organization and in the Canadian Department of National Defence.

Evaluation of the New "Growing an Innovative New Zealand" Framework
the challenges of supervising students enmeshed in ethical difficulties, when one has the goal of simultaneously resolving the problem, generating
evaluation for a client/sponsor. Special attention will be paid to: (1) the types of ethical problems encountered; (2) students' responses to these problems; (3) the
classroom setting as a case study in which we find more conflict than assistance from our Guiding Principles or Program Evaluation Standards. Our professional
codes advise us, for example, to staff to the point they will be unable to work together to improve the program? The daily work of evaluators involves responding to practical difficulties in
which we find more conflict than assistance from our Guiding Principles or Program Evaluation Standards. Our professional codes advise us, for example, to
safe guard the lives and well-being of participants as much as possible. The daily work of evaluators involves responding to practical difficulties in
which we find more conflict than assistance from our Guiding Principles or Program Evaluation Standards. Our professional codes advise us, for example, to

A Systemic Context for Designing Utilization-focused Evaluation: A Case Study on Extending the Focus of Federal Environmental Research from Outputs to Outcomes
Presenters Dale A Pahl, US Environmental Protection Agency
Emmalou Norland, US Environmental Protection Agency

Abstract Traditional research program design and performance metrics focus on attributes such as scientific quality and leadership and measure performance through peer review of research publications (outputs). This approach creates challenges in designing and managing outcome-oriented federal research, development, and technology programs. Recently, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) completed a unique evaluation study that considered how environmental research can be designed and managed to achieve outcomes. Recognition of the systemic context for this case study and its findings is a principal factor contributing to the study's usefulness. This presentation and paper describe the study's systemic context and the influence of context on framing evaluation questions and key observations. The study demonstrates that environmental research can be designed to achieve outcomes and that extending the research focus from outputs to outcomes helps EPA achieve its strategic goals under GPRA.

The Guiding Principles for Evaluators: An Evolving System for Evaluation Practice and Application
Panel Session 704 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Graduate Student TIG
Chair Stephen M Morabito, National Center for Disability Services
Discussant Ernie House, University of Colorado at Boulder

Abstract The Guiding Principles for Evaluators is an organizational system that guides AEA members with regard to the proper practice and application of evaluation. As recommended by the Task Force that developed the Guiding Principles for Evaluators, these should be revisited on an ongoing basis, and would benefit from the collective experiences and input from the membership. This session will emphasize that the Guiding Principles for Evaluators, like other organizational systems, is evolving. It has great potential to benefit from dialogue, reflection, clarification, and general feedback from the membership. The session will address the following questions: What are the experiences of Evaluators and students in dealing with ethical issues? How do the Guiding Principles for Evaluators and Program Evaluation Standards serve evaluators and clients? Are there implications for a revision of the Guiding Principles?

Ethical Uncertainties
Presenter Linda Mabry, Washington State University Vancouver

Abstract Should every effort be made to tell the whole truth in an evaluation report if an accurate report would exacerbate tensions with program staff to the point they will be unable to work together to improve the program? The daily work of evaluators involves responding to practical difficulties in which we find more conflict than assistance from our Guiding Principles or Program Evaluation Standards. Our professional codes advise us, for example, to practice with "Integrity / Honesty" but also with "Respect for People," to ensure "Accuracy" but also "Propriety" and "Utility." Do these admonitions help us decide what to do when, in the field, circumstances create dilemmas such that all the codes cannot be simultaneously be fully honored or do they ensure that we will be open to the charge that we have honored one by violating another? In this presentation, I will argue that the uniqueness of particulars in each evaluation requires case-by-case judgments that, while they may be informed by codes of conduct, cannot be decided by them.

Where Should I Step Next? When Graduate Students Wander Through Ethical Mine Fields
Presenter Michael Morris, University of New Haven

Abstract What can the experiences of graduate students teach us about evaluation ethics? In this presentation, I will reflect on 20 years of experience with ethical conflicts faced by students in a master's-level Program Evaluation course, a course that requires students to conduct (usually in teams) an actual evaluation for a client/sponsor. Special attention will be paid to: (1) the types of ethical problems encountered; (2) students' responses to these problems; (3) the challenges of supervising students enmeshed in ethical difficulties, when one has the goal of simultaneously resolving the problem, generating
substantive learning, and developing practice skills; and (4) the implications of the preceding issues for the Guiding Principles for Evaluators.

**Ethical Considerations: Membership Perspectives**

**Presenter** Katherine Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Abstract** While the other members of the panel including the discussant are noted for their expertise or work on ethics in evaluation, as the Board liaison to the AEA ethics committee, I see myself representing the perspectives of the membership in this discussion. I plan to do this by collecting stories from my colleagues concerning ethical concerns they have recently experienced. In addition to stories that show how the AEA principles and Standards work in action, I am especially interested in stories that articulate ethical concerns that are not easily addressed by consideration of the AEA principles and standards. From these stories, I expect to talk about the kinds of ethical concerns that are already addressed well and call issues that need further exploration. The sources of these stories include dialogues with colleagues, the American Journal of Evaluation section on ethics, and by contacting AEA members about their experiences on the AEA listserv. My analysis will be framed by the current AEA principles, the Program Evaluation Standards and Charles Thomas’s recent white paper, which takes up evaluation in multicultural settings. I hope to engage the audience for this panel in a dialogue concerning the implications of these stories for revising the Program Evaluation Standards and AEA Guiding Principles.

---

**Models for Planning and Evaluating Collaborative Research and Extension Projects**

**Demonstration Session 705 to be held in Ballroom F**

**Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG**

**Chair** Michael Duttweiler, Cornell University

**Presenter** Claude F Bennett, US Department of Agriculture

**Abstract** There are increasing requirements for evaluations conducted across research and extension functions; these have been stimulated by recent legislation and budgetary initiatives. The proposed will demonstrate a systematic basis for planning and evaluating public sector research and extension projects through presenting two integrative theoretical models. A macro-stage model identifies generic, overlapping roles of researchers and of extensionists in generating and diffusing needed capacities and innovations. A micro-step model suggests an approach to planning and evaluating each of the generic roles identified. The model promotes research and extension collaboration by identifying a parallelism between comparable research objectives and extension objectives. Tandem use of the macro-stage model and the micro-step model can help to develop output and impact objectives for a collaborative project’s extension function as well as for its research function. Use of the models should help research and extension staffs to plan and evaluate joint extension and research efforts.

---

**A Systematic Effort to Enhance Evaluation Through Checklist Development**

**Panel Session 706 to be held in the Washington A room**

**Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG**

**Chair** Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University

**Discussant** Daniel L Stufflebeam, Western Michigan University

**Systemic Change as a Result of Materials Development: The Evaluation Checklist Project Example**

**Presenter** Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University

**The Evaluation Checklist Project: Content, Procedures, and Plans**

**Presenter** Lori Wingate, Western Michigan University

**Systemic Implications of Online Scoring for Evaluation Checklists**

**Presenter** Dale S Farland, Western Michigan University

**Evaluation of the Evaluation Checklist Project Web Site**

**Presenter** Barbara A Bichelmeyer, Indiana University

---

**Collaborative Models for K-12 Evaluations**

**MultiPaper Session 707 to be held in the Washington B room**

**Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG**

**Chair** Elizabeth A Holtzapple, Cincinnati Public Schools

**Evaluating a Safety Net for At-risk Students: Impact of Research-based Interventions on Non-cognitive Measures**
Presenters: William P Neace, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
Marco A Munoz, Jefferson County Public Schools
Knowlton Johnson, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

Abstract: An outcome evaluation was conducted for seven Project SHIELD research-based interventions using secondary data from the 26th largest school district in the nation. This study reports the short-term one-year results of a three-year program and examines whether there is an interim effect on K-12 non-cognitive outcomes. Non-cognitive outcome measures were the unexcused absences, unexcused tardies, and disciplinary actions. For the universal interventions, a pre-post non-equivalent control group design was used to analyze the outcome data. The focused interventions were analyzed using a pre-post non-equivalent control group design and pre-post only design, depending on the availability of sufficient numbers of control students. Results indicated that there are some positive trends for students involved in Project SHIELD interventions. Furthermore, results indicated that some of the programs need full implementation and some other programs required mid-term adjustments. Implications for evaluation theory and practice as well as educational policy will be discussed.

System Impact Through Grant Implementation Fidelity
Presenters: Sarah E Bailey, Baylor Evaluation Services Center
Joseph E Nyre, Baylor University
Majka W Mitchell, Baylor Evaluation Services Center

Abstract: Within the field of educational reform, grant supported program expansion and enrichment initiatives are often criticized when they become "add-on" programs rather than long-term supported systemic changes. This presentation articulates how a well-formulated and implemented evaluation increased the probability of systemic change and increased grant fidelity, resulting in the successful incorporation of new programs into an existing system. The Baylor Evaluation Services Center was contracted by the McLennan County Youth Commission to evaluate a U.S. Department of Education funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant in Waco Independent School District (Waco ISD, Texas) school sites. Initially 70 grant partners were involved in the program with the objective of enriching after-school activities at low SES elementary schools and all of the middle schools. Formative evaluation during Year 1 produced a set of interventions for Year 2 that resulted in value-added system modifications. The evaluation team established indicators that readily identify sites where implementation falters, i.e. High, Mid, Low grant implementation fidelity. Results indicate methods employed during the evaluation played a significant role in increasing the effectiveness of the system deploying grant-supported services.

Evaluation and the Reform of Education in the Visual and Performing Arts
Presenters: Robert L Johnson, University of South Carolina
Christina Schneider, University of South Carolina
Margaret E Gredler, University of South Carolina

Abstract: Within the field of educational reform, grant supported program expansion and enrichment initiatives are often criticized when they become "add-on" programs rather than long-term supported systemic changes. This presentation articulates how a well-formulated and implemented evaluation increased the probability of systemic change and increased grant fidelity, resulting in the successful incorporation of new programs into an existing system. The Baylor Evaluation Services Center was contracted by the McLennan County Youth Commission to evaluate a U.S. Department of Education funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant in Waco Independent School District (Waco ISD, Texas) school sites. Initially 70 grant partners were involved in the program with the objective of enriching after-school activities at low SES elementary schools and all of the middle schools. Formative evaluation during Year 1 produced a set of interventions for Year 2 that resulted in value-added system modifications. The evaluation team established indicators that readily identify sites where implementation falters, i.e. High, Mid, Low grant implementation fidelity. Results indicate methods employed during the evaluation played a significant role in increasing the effectiveness of the system deploying grant-supported services.

How They See Us: Perspectives of Program Personnel on Evaluation
Presenters: Jennifer E Williams, University of Cincinnati
Nancy Rogers, University of Cincinnati
Nithya Narayanaswamy, University of Cincinnati

Abstract: The most productive and mutually beneficial evaluations are those which begin with a thorough understanding of the clients' prior experience with and current attitudes towards the evaluation process. This research explores the evaluation experience from the perspective of evaluands working in college access programs for middle and high school students. It considers personal traits that the client-participants have and how those traits might interact with their opinions about the evaluation of their own programs. The study includes descriptions of client's coping mechanisms (both constructive and counter-productive) as well as suggestions for making evaluations more rewarding. Understanding evaluands' points of view and potential anxiety can contribute to enhanced communication, collaboration, and ultimately, richer data to increase the overall quality of the evaluation.
Tracking the Self-regulation of Health Behaviors: Alcohol Use as a Case Study

Panel Session 708 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair Frederick L Newman, Florida International University
Discussant Michael L Dennis, Chestnut Health Systems

The Self-regulation of Health: Definitions and Applications
Presenter Christopher Rice, Florida International University
Abstract The presentation will focus on self-regulation, its conceptualization, tradition of measurement, and use as an indicator of successful treatment intervention. Alcohol dependence/abuse will serve as a case study in this discussion. Outcome from alcoholism treatment has been considered a dichotomous event. Either the person was drinking (relapse) or the person was abstinent (success). Data from clinical trials employing multiple assessment points suggest a different perspective. Multiple fluctuations between drinking and abstinence prior to the emergence of either drinking or abstinence as the dominant behavior pattern appear normative. A redefinition of treatment outcome is proposed so that the conceptualization better fits the empirical evidence. The reconceptualization of post-intervention drinking behavior entails the recognition of a binary ratio of abstinence to drinking as the primitive unit and the concatenation of these units as representing a trajectory of self-regulation over a time period of interest.

Examining the Trajectories of Adolescent Substance Users
Presenter Dennis D Deck, RMC Research Corporation
Abstract Recent research on adolescent treatment has examined trajectories of substance use following discharge from substance abuse treatment but not the months prior to and following admission. A sample of 325 adolescents entering publicly funded substance abuse treatment in Oregon and Washington were interviewed using a Timeline Followback protocol at admission and 6 months, yielding a continuous 12-month record of substance use. The average days per month that adolescents used each substance declined during the months prior to admission. Use remained low for the six months following admission. To examine mechanisms that might account for these trajectories, analyses by referral pathway, court mandate, motivation, and treatment history were conducted, controlling for severity. In general, no differences in trajectories were found. The findings of this study have implications for the measurement of use in treatment effectiveness studies. More attention should be given to behavioral changes during the identification and referral process.

Describing the Trajectory of Self-regulation Overtime: Another Alternative
Presenter Frederick L Newman, Florida International University
Abstract The presentation will detail the methods for creating an "adherence/ non-adherence" dyad (e.g., # days of abstinence followed by # days of drinking, dyad in the self regulation of drinking) to map the changes in a person's efforts (or non-efforts) to self regulate their behaviors. The advantages and limitations of this approach will be contrasted with those evaluative approaches that are traditionally used in the literature. This will be followed by a discussion of the possible application of both approaches to mapping the trajectories of other health behaviors.

Consumer-operated Service Programs (COSP) and the Mental Health Service System: Shaping the Design and Analysis of a Multi-site Study to Reflect and Affect the System
Panel Session 709 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair Jean C Campbell, Missouri Institute of Mental Health
Discussants Crystal Blyler, Center for Mental Health Services
Gazala Ansari, American University
Session Abstract This panel will provide an overview of the design, analysis planning, implementation assessment, and baseline findings from the Consumer-Operated Service Programs (COSP) Multi-site Research Initiative, a federally-funded four-year study. It will examine the ways in which the historical role of consumer-operated programs within the continuum of community mental health services and the desire for full participation of mental health
consumers shaped: (1) the design of the multisite cooperative agreement and the development of a common outcome protocol; (2) efforts to assess the ways in which the consumer operated programs were similar to and different from traditional services and each other; (3) the emphasis on costs and issues of integrating the study of costs into the evaluation design; and (4) the cross-site analytic strategy. The potential impact of the evaluation on the mental health services system will be discussed.

**Overview of the COSP Multi-site Research Initiative**

Presenter: Jean C Campbell, Missouri Institute of Mental Health

Abstract: In 1999 the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) funded a study of the effectiveness of consumer-operated service programs for adults with serious and persistent mental illness, when the services are offered as an adjunct to traditional mental health services. The multisite evaluation uses an experimental design with random assignment at eight sites. A common protocol assesses empowerment, housing, employment, social inclusion, satisfaction with services, and costs. A secondary goal of the initiative includes creating strong, productive partnerships among consumers, service providers, and researchers. This presentation will discuss efforts to ensure that the project is consumer-friendly and features of the multi-site design, along with observations on the need to balance the dynamic forces inherent in a multi-stakeholder collaboration against the realities of field studies and current standards of evidence in the mental health service system. The implications for expanding system capacity and outcomes while reducing costs will be discussed.

**Defining Consumer-operated Service Programs**

Presenters: Matthew Johnsen, University of Massachusetts

Lisa Patton, Northrup Grumman Information Technology Health Solutions and Services

Abstract: The mental health system's growing emphasis on controlled studies that have been replicated as a basis for integrating new services into existing systems of care requires careful attention to defining the programs being studied and their relationship to services that are already a part of the system. The seven COSP study sites incorporate three different consumer-operated program models: drop-in centers, peer-support programs, and education-advocacy programs. This presentation will discuss the efforts of the COSP Coordinating Center to define the programs by: identifying a set of common ingredients that are present to some degree in all consumer-operated service programs; designing an instrument—the Fidelity Assessment/Common Ingredient Tool (FACIT)—to assess the extent to which each of the identified Common Ingredients was present at each site; and administering the FACIT during site visits. An overview of data collection and how this information will be integrated into the cross-site analyses will be discussed.

**Some "Do's" and "Don'ts" in Conducting Multi-site Cost Studies**

Presenters: Brian T Yates, American University

Danyelle Mannix, American University

Michael Freed, American University

Session Abstract: Ask a program how effective it is, and it becomes concerned. Ask it how much it costs, and the program becomes alarmed. Ask the program how cost-effective it is, and whether it’s cost-beneficial, and it begins to wonder if evaluation is a good idea. But, when building a research basis for promising services, it is important to recognize the necessity of collecting cost data in addition to study outcomes. However, the resources and expertise required for such an endeavor may exceed the budget of most investigators. Even in well-funded research efforts, evaluating costs, benefits, cost-effectiveness, and cost-benefit is at least as challenging as evaluating outcomes. We begin with 10 "do's" and "don'ts" for conducting studies of costs, benefits, cost-effectiveness, and cost-benefit in research settings where multiple stakeholders are similarly empowered. Findings of cost per consumer, and of relationships between costs, program activities, consumer processes, and outcomes in the COSP programs are detailed.

**Cross-site Analysis Strategy and Baseline Findings from the COSP Multi-site Study**

Presenters: Carolyn Lichtenstein, Northrup Grumman Information Technology Health Solutions

L Joseph Sonnefeld, NGIT Health Solutions

Kristin Zempolich, Northrup Grumman Information Technology Health Solutions and Services

Abstract: Analytical issues were raised by the multisite design. The inclusion of diverse programs and the absence prior controlled efficacy studies dictate a "bottom-up" strategy, in which the heterogeneity of program characteristics and outcomes is examined before pooling data within program clusters or across sites. In addition, the lack of pilot studies suggested relying on analyses of the cross-site baseline data to assess: new outcome measures; their relationship to prior participation in consumer programs; the quality of program-participation data; and program theory. The analytical strategy will be illustrated using patterns in the characteristics of the participants to assess the implementation of randomization; differences among clusters of sites; and some properties of key outcome measures. The psychometric properties of scales and some correlations among them predicted by the program theory will be examined. Variation within and between the clusters of programs (drop-in centers, peer support programs, and education-advocacy programs) will be described, along with implications for pooling data.
Understanding Organizations Through the Organizational Communication Culture Method

Demonstration Session 710 to be held in the Potomac III room

Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG

Chair
James S Sass, Los Angeles Unified School District

Presenters
James S Sass, Los Angeles Unified School District
Robert L Krizek, Saint Louis University

Abstract
From initial contact to evaluation use, evaluation occurs within an organizational context. Evaluators' understanding of the organization is crucial to their professional effectiveness. The Organizational Communication Culture Method (OCCM) is a proven means for evaluators to gain understanding of an organization. While less resource-intensive than an ethnographic study, the OCCM provides rich data not available through a survey. This demonstration will move sequentially through the OCCM's procedures for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. For each of these three steps, the facilitators will provide a brief overview, practical guidelines, and illustrations from organizations in a variety of fields (e.g., healthcare, human services, and professional sports). Participants will receive worksheets with explanations and figures related to the OCCM, as well as an organizational communication culture bibliography. Applicable to all evaluators, this demonstration is especially appropriate for evaluators without formal training in organizational studies or qualitative methods.

The Building Diversity Initiative: An Effort to Effect the American Evaluation Association and the Evaluation Profession

Panel Session 711 to be held in the Potomac IV room

Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

Chair
David M Chavis, Association for the Study and Development of Community

Presenters
Donna M Mertens, Gallaudet University
Hazel Symonette, University of Wisconsin at Madison
Edith P Thomas, US Department of Agriculture
Kien S Lee, Association for the Study and Development of Community

Session Abstract
The purpose of AEA’s Building Diversity Initiative is to improve the quality and effectiveness of evaluation by expanding the ethnic and cultural diversity of the evaluation profession and by improving the capacity of evaluators to work across cultures. This session, in the form of a town hall meeting, will update the larger AEA membership about the Initiative’s progress and continue to invite members’ involvement in supporting the plan. The AEA Board has endorsed the first set of recommendations presented by the Building Diversity Initiative and has invited the appropriate TIGs and committees to take the lead in carrying them out, including training workshops to address the professional and small business development needs of evaluators of color and evaluators working in multicultural settings; establishment of a Council of Evaluation Training Programs; discussion about the incorporation of diversity issues into the program evaluation standards; advertisement of jobs for evaluators of color and evaluators with cross-cultural skills; and creation of a fellowship program for students of color.

Empowerment Evaluation and Foundations

Panel Session 712 to be held in the Potomac V room

Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

Chair
Abraham Wandersman, University of South Carolina

Discussant
Ricardo Millett, The Woods Fund

Session Abstract
Foundations are often engaged in grants to local agencies and community groups. It is essential that the grants are conducted in an accountable manner. Increasingly, foundations are interested in building the capacity of the grantees to obtain positive outcomes. Several foundations have developed exploratory approaches that Wandersman has called results-oriented grantmaking/grant implementation (ROGG). This session includes presentations that describe developing examples of this approach.

Empowerment Evaluation & Results-Oriented Grantmaking: How Foundations and Evaluators Can Assist Applicants and Grantees in Developing Evaluation Capacity
Nonprofit organizations typically lack the capacity to plan for, monitor, and capture results in their programming. In response, "Results-Oriented Grantmaking and Grant-Implementation" (ROGG), a systematic guide and set of tools for accomplishing these tasks has been developed. ROGG can be augmented by providing applicants and grantees with consultation and training by evaluators. The intended outcome of ROGG is to build the capacity of grantees to continue and generalize their self-evaluation skills throughout their programming.

**When the Evaluation Coach Becomes Quality Improvement Adviser: Multi-task Coaching for Nonprofits**

*Presenter*
Arlene B Andrews, University of South Carolina

**Putting It All Together: The Art and Science of Foundation Accountability**

*Presenter*
Margret Dugan, Margret Dugan Consulting

**Putting It All Together: The Art and Science of Foundation Accountability**

*Abstract*
This session will discuss how current trends in philanthropy— which are moving toward ever greater proficiency and effectiveness— may be reducing funding for problems that are rife with uncertainty, risk and inefficiency whose potential for failure is high. This new philanthropy may be pushing foundations to fund projects and activities that are easily quantifiable and highly visible, resulting in short term wins, but which may not address the tough, messy and seemingly insoluble problems of underlying causes. Empowerment evaluation techniques can support foundation accountability that pushes foundations to greater openness about mission, core values, and their partners. Accountability that according to the James Irvine Foundation, communicates clarity of purpose, unambiguous policies and procedures, and an openness to criticism and new ideas...[one in which we can] learn from our work, acknowledge our failures and improve our practices.

**Reflections on Teaching Evaluation**

*MultiPaper Session 713 to be held in the Potomac VI room*

**Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
Aisha K Tucker-Brown, University of Georgia

**The One-year Evaluation Course: A Conceptual Framework**

*Presenters*
Barbara Rosenstein, Ben Gurion University of the Negev
Miri Levin-Rozalis, Ben Gurion University of the Negev

**Abstract**
The dialog between theory and practice form a frame within which the evaluation course should develop. Thus, the authors have constructed a conceptual framework for teaching evaluation against the background of mentoring. The task of the evaluation course is to teach the competencies required to perform evaluations that provide the sense-making needed for informed decision-making by eliciting, providing and often conceptualizing information, interactions, processes, and experiences. The authors have found that these competencies are based on four kinds of knowledge: theoretical knowledge, practical knowledge, conceptualization of practice (converting tacit to explicit knowledge) and knowledge of personal skills. This paper discusses each kind of knowledge, the type of learning needed to master it, the format adopted in the course for teaching it, the dilemmas that arose in the course of study and practice, and proposed solutions.

**Cooperative Learning and Peer Assessment: Approaches for Teaching Program Evaluation**

*Presenters*
Katye M Perry, Oklahoma State University
Rosita Long, Evaluation Research Institute

**Abstract**
Drawing from an instructor's multi-year experience in teaching an entry level program evaluation course with students representing various academic disciplines, the purpose of this presentation is to share trial and error experiences with instruction designed to help students develop an appreciation and excitement for, as well as a realistic experience for their potential involvement in program evaluation. Therefore, this presentation will present a description of the blending and application of cooperative learning and peer assessment as a viable instructional strategy to accomplish this end. At the same time, the approach blends theory with practice. Moreover, the presentation will provide literature support and student feedback to support the use of this instructional approach for teaching program evaluation.

**Using Simulations, EVALTALK, and Lessons Learned as Tools for Teaching Program Evaluation**

*Presenter*
Monika Schäffner, Bowling Green State University

**Abstract**
The evaluator's role is complex and cannot be learned from textbooks or limited, single course exposure alone. The use of simulations in the classroom and lessons learned, especially those of unanticipated outcomes, can be powerful tools in the teaching of program evaluation. Unanticipated outcomes of programs the author is or has evaluated are used as illustrations of lessons learned to enhance and showcase different perspectives and approaches to program evaluation. Presented is one teacher's attempt at a Midwest State University to get students to acquire practitioner skills, albeit
What is Complex Systems Theory, and What Does it Say About How We Evaluate and How We Think About Evaluation?

Panel Session 714 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG
Chair Jonathan A Morell, Altarum
Session Abstract Complex systems theory (CST) provides a view of social and organizational behavior that differs in profound ways from our usual ways of thinking about the world. Familiar notions such as causality, change, prediction, order, coordination, conflict, interaction with environment, and the origins of complex behavior - all these and many more concepts take on new meanings. This panel will introduce basic concepts of CST, and contrast the CST view with our better known and more comfortable understanding of evaluation theory. The intent of the panel is begin a dialogue within the evaluation community about when CST may be useful in evaluation, and the implications of that applicability for our theories, practices, and methodologies.

Brief Overview of Complex Systems Theory and Its Implications for Evaluation Theory
Presenter Jonathan A Morell, Altarum
Abstract We use theory to shape evaluation, and often our faith is rewarded with good programs and good evaluation. Often, though, either the program, or its evaluation, or both, do not work as expected. The usual prescription to remedy failure is to try harder. We must do a better job of understanding how a program really works. We must put more work into assuring fidelity of program reality to program theory. We must change the variables we measure, or do a better job of measurement, or use a more powerful mix of methodologies. But there is another possible explanation for failure. It may be that our theories miss the true dynamics that explain system behavior. This would be the case for evaluation settings that are best described with the principles of Complex System Theory (CST). This possibility, and its implications, will be put before the audience.

Tools for Evaluating Within a Complex System Theory (CST) Framework
Presenter Glenda H Eoyang, Chaos Limited Inc
Abstract Complex System Theory (CST) deals with inherently unpredictable systems, and thus challenges some central assumptions that have formed the foundation of quantitative evaluation. Complex systems defy traditional notions of causality because they involve causal relationships that are mutual, high dimension, massively entangled, and sensitive to initial conditions. Evaluators have learned to apply qualitative approaches to capture the emergent and rich nature of complex systems as they adapt. Research and practice with complex systems in a variety of disciplines, however, has led to the development of quantitative and quasi-quantitative tools and techniques that provide useful information about the process and outcomes of complex nonlinear systems. Short lists, time series analysis, computer simulation models, self-organized criticality, and fitness landscapes are examples of CST tools and techniques that may prove helpful to evaluators who work in unpredictable human systems. These approaches are described, examples are explored, and references are provided.

Embedded Assumptions in Program Theory: Context Setting for Thinking Beyond the Traditional
Presenter Huey-Tsyh Chen, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Abstract Traditional outcome evaluation emphasizes the relationship between the input and output of a program. This approach focuses heavily on issues such as interval validity, measurement, manipulation, and covariation. The program theory perspective makes a strong case that to be useful, outcome evaluation should look into the mechanisms that mediate input and output, as well as the context under which causal processes operate. Program theory argues for making explicit assumptions about causation, construct validity and generalization. Theory based evaluation produces information on the strengths and weaknesses of a program. However, the program theory perspective is still in a developmental stage. This presentation will outline key assumptions in program theory as we usually practice it, in order to set a context for exploring the possibility of using CST to strengthen the theory based approach to evaluation.

Why Bother to Call This a "System"?
Presenter Bob Williams, Independent Consultant
Abstract As evaluation practitioners increasingly use the word "system", and delve deeper into systems based approaches, should we reflect on what the word "system" actually means. What exactly is a system? What isn't a system? What are the basic properties of a system, who says so, why do they say that, and do they agree with each other? How would we recognise a system if we fell over it? Are we physically able to fall over one anyway? Can we mentally fall over one? Are these questions for theorists only, or are they relevant when we actually use systems based approaches? This presentation will explore these questions, with a focus on the needs and perspectives of evaluation practitioners as well as theorists.
Roundtables: Methods II

Note: These Roundtables are offered in two 45-minute rotations. The Chair will ask the presenters to rotate at 8:45 am.

Roundtables Session 715 to be held in the Tidewater room

Chair Patrick McKnight, University of Arizona

First Rotation – Table A: Longitudinal Data Analysis

Presenter Stacie A Hudgens, Evanston Northwestern Healthcare

Abstract Longitudinal data analysis is a difficult topic for both evaluators and program staff due to the effects of internal validity (i.e., attrition, drop-out, etc.). Methods for the analysis of longitudinal data, especially in an evaluation setting, are of great use to the practitioners due to the decision-making powers of data results. It is necessary for the analyst, as well as the programmer, to understand and become intimate with the data over-time. One problem that arises in longitudinal data is the notion of missing data. This problem causes false positives as well as miscalculations. It is imperative to understand the nature of missing data overtime and adjust for the rationale prior to analysis. This, of course, brings into question, methodology. The methodology proposed in this workshop is that of longitudinal analysis and the methods for these analyses. Software capabilities, instrument design, and analyst experience, all play an important role in these outcomes. Therefore, they will be a primary focus. Specifically, repeated measures models, mixed effects models, growth curve analysis, pattern mixture models, and survival analysis will be used to demonstrate the differences between data missing at random and data not missing at random in longitudinal analysis.

First Rotation – Table B: Impact of Two Survey Designs on the Evaluation of a 21st Century Learning Centers Project

Presenter Zandra S Gratz, Kean University

Abstract The impact of two survey designs on the evaluation of a 21st Century Learning Centers project for at-risk middle school youngsters was examined. In one design, a survey was administered pre and post participation which asked teachers to assess the frequency with which youngsters demonstrated specific school-related behaviors. In the second design, one survey was administered post participation which asked teachers to indicate if the frequency of youngsters’ school-related behaviors changed. In total, teachers of 125 participants completed surveys using both survey designs. Responses to the post only survey were substantially more positive than differences computed via the pre/post survey design. Analyses suggest that in the post only design, the frequency of the behavior at the time the survey was administered, and not a change in behavior, was the basis of the change rating. The impact of survey design on evaluation results is discussed.

First Rotation – Table C: Random Assignment: A Systematic Review

Presenter Souraya Sidani, University of Toronto

Abstract Conducting evaluation research while applying the experimental design presents some challenges. Of these, random assignment, i.e., randomization of the participants to the treatment or control group has been of concern to evaluators. Randomization increases the likelihood of achieving initial group equivalence, which minimizes selection bias and the influence of extraneous factors on outcomes. Randomization, however, has been reported not to guarantee initial group equivalence under some circumstances. It also is associated with other threats to validity, such as demoralization and is often defeated by staff. In this paper, the advantages and limitations of randomization in treatment evaluation will be presented. The points of discussion will be supported by results of a systematic review of 100 studies which used randomization. Alternatives to randomization will be suggested.

First Rotation – Table D: The Use of Incentives to Increase Follow-up Response Rate

Presenter Sarah Hurley, Youth Villages

Abstract A study was conducted to determine if offering a small incentive to parents increases their participation in follow-up interviews. The study site is a large provider of mental health services to children and their families. After discharge from five of the programs in the facility, follow-up phone surveys are conducted at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months post discharge. The survey includes questions about the child’s current school, social, and legal status, as well as a rather lengthy (15-20 minutes) family assessment measure. For a six-month period, a drawing was held each month for a $25 gift certificate to a local retailer - all families who completed the survey were entered into the drawing. Response rates during the six months are compared with those achieved prior to the drawings, and analysis of response rates by period (months post discharge), program, and location are reported.

First Rotation – Table E: Using a Collaborative Evaluation Approach in the Design of Access Databases for Small Programs

Presenter Paul Masina, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Abstract This paper focuses on the collaborative evaluation methods used in the design of Microsoft Access Databases for small programs. Small programs are often met with the challenges of low resources, large commitments, and little time. Collaborative Evaluation methods alleviate some of these concerns by leveraging existing resources into higher quality programs and stronger organizations. Often, small programs spend the majority of their time on program activities, rather than the collection and organization of data. Evaluation tools that
minimize time and maximize utility are of great importance. One tool that can be used for this purpose is an Access database. Using methods that focus on simplicity of operation and maximum compatibility with program needs and can be of great importance to small programs.

**First Rotation – Table F: Using Population Statistics in the Context of Standardized Test Scores**

**Presenters**
- Sharon A Ramsden, WestEd
- Juan Carlos Bojorquez, WestEd
- Treseen McCormick, WestEd
- Jerry Bailey, WestEd

**Abstract**
The mission of the Beckman@Science program is to prepare children for the future by making science a core subject throughout elementary school. The program goes beyond traditional textbook teaching, using a hands-on, minds-on approach to more fully experience the lesson. An external evaluation of the program found significant increases in standardized test scores in science, mathematics and reading. For the analysis of the data, population statistics, rather than sampling methods, were used because test scores were available for all students. Special measures were taken because the reliability of the Stanford9 instrument was not available. The current presentation will discuss the use of population statistics with unknown reliabilities as well as standardized test score findings from the evaluation of the Beckman@Science initiative.

**First Rotation – Table G: A Framework for Implementation Research: Toward Better Program Description and Explanation of Effects**

**Presenter**
- Thomas Brock, Manpower Demonstration Research Corp

**Abstract**
Evaluations of program effects inevitably raise questions about program implementation. Were services adequately funded? Did program staff follow procedures? Did clients participate or receive services as intended? Did environmental conditions affect service demand? Because so many factors influence program implementation, evaluators often struggle with knowing how to focus their research. Moreover, the evaluation field lacks consensus on what constitutes a ‘good’ implementation study. In this session, Thomas Brock, Senior Research Associate at the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), will present a framework for implementation research that can be used as a handbook or guide for designing or conducting an implementation study. It identifies the major units of analysis and primary research questions that will produce a well-rounded program description and identify key factors that may explain program effects. The framework is based on a review of research literature, consultation with experts, and MDRC’s 25-year history of evaluation.

**Second Rotation – Table A: Walking the Tightrope: Student Reflections of the Strengths and Challenges in a Participatory Reflection Process of a PhD Program**

**Presenters**
- Melanie B Grant, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- Barbara A Feroz, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- Tina Fitzpatrick, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

**Abstract**
In year four of a new interdisciplinary doctoral program, the Administration and Leadership (ALS) PhD program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, the Advisory Committee decided to undertake a participatory reflection process with the purpose of continuing program improvement. Executing the assessment led to a path of spider webs encasing political, ethical, and methodological questions. We will present our reflections as students of both the PhD program and the Sociology MasterÆs program that served on the research team that guided this process. We will discuss both the positive and negative aspects of the qualitative methods used to solicit input from all stakeholders in the program and the hurdles we had to overcome to perform the evaluation process. In addition, we will discuss the participatory analysis process from the students, faculty and administration via a list serve we used to generate discussion of the findings.

**Second Rotation – Table B: Validity and the Stakeholder/Evaluator Relationship**

**Presenters**
- Stephen N Kitzis, Fort Hays State University
- Joyce A Wolfe, Fort Hays State University

**Abstract**
While the need to collect and analyze data is a primary responsibility of evaluators, one must not overlook the importance of the stakeholder/evaluator relationship as an important determinant in data quality. If not careful, the evaluator can appear to be “the scientist”, that is, one who comes in, collects the data, and then retreats to a secluded statistical lair until the final report. To avoid the perception of “white coat arrogance”, evaluators should establish and maintain mutual trust and respect with stakeholders. Topics for roundtable discussion include: Does a good stakeholder/evaluator relationship result in better data quality? What is the optimal relationship and how is it developed? Are there difficulties in establishing it depending upon the size of the project (for example: rural, metropolitan, cross-site)? Are there subject areas that tend to resist a more sympathetic approach? Are there dangers of a “respectful evaluation” being subverted by special interest groups?

**Second Rotation – Table C: The Phenomenology of Action Research & Open Systems Theory**
Abstract This study assesses the learning culture of community agencies and its relation to evaluation practices. Representatives from community agencies serving children and youth in Northern California (n=30) completed surveys about their outcomes measurement practices and learning culture. Descriptive information about positive and negative aspects of learning culture, perceived importance of evaluation, and data collection activities can be used as a model for other evaluators who are approached by clients who would benefit from an evaluation, but have limited funding.
Abstract in 1999, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) published its Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health. This framework was intended as a tool for public health professionals. It provides the user with a systematic approach to program evaluation by outlining essential steps and standards in evaluation practice and has relevance across many public health practice settings. This presentation describes the practical application of this framework in conducting a participatory evaluation of the citizen advisory process utilized by two federal agencies for public input into radiation health research and public health activities. The utility of the Framework for both carrying out the project and educating agency staff and community collaborators about evaluation is reviewed. Because this was a collaborative project between the government and community members, emphasis is given to implementation of steps that involved engaging the stakeholders, focusing the design, and ensuring use of lessons learned.

A Participatory Evaluation of a Community-Agency Partnership

Benefits, Challenges and Limitations in Using a Collaborative Approach to Evaluate a Community-Federal Agency Advisory Process

Using Evaluation to Improve Public Input into Environmental Public Health Activities

Systemic Challenges to Effective Evaluation Practices in Non-profit Organizations

Results, Strengths, and Short Comings of Key Informant Interviews in the Measurement of Community Building and Social Capital Outcomes in Communities Involved in the Community Partnership for Healthy Children Initiative
Abstract. Substance abuse clients often seek medical attention for conditions that are related to substance abuse. Substance abuse clients also incur higher treatment and hospitalization costs and have more inpatient and emergency room visits annually (Burke et al. 1995; Marik & Mohedin 1996). Post-substance abuse treatment costs may decline among private pay clients (Holder & Blose 1992; Parthasarthy et al. 2001), but outcomes for clients in VA programs and public sector programs appear more varied (Goodman et al. 1997). In this paper, we examine health services utilization among substance abuse clients in a public sector treatment program before and after treatment. We examine whether substance abuse treatment leads to reduced use of health services for substance abuse-related medical visits. The study will use administrative data from county systems to look at substance abuse clients before and after treatment as compared to an age-sex matched group of hospitalized and ambulatory clients. (150 words)

Systemic Factors and the Shape of Alcohol and Drug Service Evaluation in Victoria, Australia
Presenter. Lynda B Berends, Turning Point Alcohol & Drug Centre
Abstract. In 1994 the Victorian state government restructured the alcohol and drug service system. This involved the closure of large institutions and the establishment of a range of community services. The restructure included a commitment to service monitoring and evaluation. A statewide service monitoring system was introduced and a schedule of process evaluation commenced. The majority of alcohol and drug services have since been evaluated. An examination of published reports reveals how the evaluations were shaped by their systemic context, including the development of standard terms of reference, expectations regarding data collection, the establishment of reporting and monitoring structures, and the inclusion of statewide data sources. Advantages and limitations of the current approach to service evaluation are highlighted through the examination of projects involving special needs groups, including Indigenous communities and young people. Directions for future work are identified.

Building Consensus for a Statewide Substance Abuse Treatment Model
Presenters. David A Netwick, State University of New York at Albany
Nicole Catapano, State University of New York at Albany
Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract. To develop a shared vision for the implementation of a research-based treatment model in Vermont, key stakeholders across the state engaged in a consensus-building process over the course of a year. Using the “3I Model for Evaluating Systems Change,” this paper documents the systems change processes and outcomes that occurred as Vermont strived for consensus and a plan for implementation of a consistent treatment delivery system. Of particular interest, the evaluation includes the need for re-visioning during the initiation phase to ensure movement toward consensus and to pre-empt technology transfer difficulties in the implementation process.

Health Services Utilization Before and After Substance Abuse Treatment in a Public Sector Treatment System
Presenters. Kakoli Banerjee, Alcohol & Drug Services Research Institute
Hung Nguyen, Alcohol & Drug Services Research Institute
Martha Beattiie, Alcohol & Drug Services Research Institute
Abstract. Substance abuse clients often seek medical attention for conditions that are related to substance abuse. Substance abuse clients also incur higher treatment and hospitalization costs and have more inpatient and emergency room visits annually (Burke et al. 1995; Marik & Mohedin 1996). Post-substance abuse treatment costs may decline among private pay clients (Holder & Blose 1992; Parthasarthy et al. 2001), but outcomes for clients in VA programs and public sector programs appear more varied (Goodman et al. 1997). In this paper, we examine health services utilization among substance abuse clients in a public sector treatment program before and after treatment. We examine whether substance abuse treatment leads to reduced use of health services for substance abuse-related medical visits. The study will use administrative data from county systems to look at substance abuse clients before and after treatment as compared to an age-sex matched group of hospitalized and ambulatory clients. (150 words)

Comparing Self-report Data with Administrative Data: Two Cases
Presenters. Michael W Finigan, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc
Robbianne TM Cole, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc
Juliette R Mackin, Northwest Professional Consortium Inc
Abstract. This paper examines the relationship between data gathered on the same individuals through extensive self-report instruments and through administrative data sets. Two separate studies completed by NPC Research in 2001 are reported. In one study, adults with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse issues were interviewed using a self-report instrument at baseline, 3 and 12 months as part of a national study funded by CSAT and CMHS. Their responses on issues of service utilization and criminal arrests were then compared to those gathered in official administrative databases. In a second study, juvenile offenders with substance use problems were interviewed at baseline, 6 and 12 months as part of a national study funded by CSAT. Their responses on issues of service utilization and criminal arrests were also compared to those gathered in official administrative databases. Some insights into the reliability and validity of self-report and administrative data are presented.
Systemizing Monitoring and Evaluation in CARE International
Panel Session 719 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair Jim Rugh, CARE International
Discussant Jim Rugh, CARE International
Session Abstract During the past three years there has been a major initiative to improve the quality of project Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DME) in CARE, a large international relief and development agency working in 65 countries. This has involved identifying best practices, distilling them down to some basic standards, measuring the capacity of staff and partners to meet those standards, and then developing strategies for enhancing the capacities for more effective DME. During this session some of the main protagonists in this initiative will share their experiences and lessons learned. They represent CARE-wide, Regional, Country and project perspectives. This session should be of interest to others who are responsible for developing strategies for improving the quality of M&E practices in international agencies. Note: Attending Jim Rugh’s separate Demonstration session will provide participants a useful introduction to how the DME principles were communicated as part of the capacity assessment process.
Assessing Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity at Country Office Level in CARE: The Mid-East and Eastern European Regional Perspective
Presenter Mary Picard, CARE International
Abstract CARE is responding not only to donor pressure to measure and demonstrate the impact of its initiatives, but to its own internal goals of becoming a learning organization, by taking a hard look at its strengths and weaknesses in Design, Monitoring, Evaluating (DME), documenting, and learning from the results of its programs. To mainstream the adoption of DME standards, regional management units within CARE are promoting and assisting Country Offices (COs) to undertake DME capacity assessments to use as a baseline for improving the quality and systematization of monitoring and evaluating project/program outcomes, as well as staff skills. This has enabled COs to use the findings to set performance goals and develop strategies for achieving them. This presentation will review specific examples from the Middle East and East Europe region of how that process has worked at the CO level and what we have learned from it to date.
Assessing Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity at Country Office Level in CARE: The Asia Regional Perspective
Presenter Frank Noij, CARE International
Abstract Frank Noij’s presentation will similar to Mary’s, though from the Asia Regional perspective, and a within the context of very different levels of Country Office DME capacities.
Assessing Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity in CARE India
Presenters George Kurian, CARE International
Manish Subharwal, CARE India
Abstract The CARE Country Office in India (a huge organization reaching 21 million beneficiaries) undertook a comprehensive assessment of its capacities in the areas of Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DME) in order to learn that what it takes in these areas to improve program quality and impact. The experience of this assessment has shown that this is a good method to bring about systemic processes that reform systems. CARE’s DME Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT) is a comprehensive analytical tool to learn about important aspects required for good practices that can ensure systemic changes and greater impact. What were the steps and process followed in this assessment in India? What results have been derived? In what ways has this led to improved staff and institutional capacity? The presentation will highlight the lessons learned in these respects.
Overview of the Assessing Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity Assessment Process in CARE
Presenter Jim Rugh, CARE International
Abstract After the others have presented from the Regional and Country Office perspectives, Jim will share a little more about the over-all process and results from the DME Capacity Assessments. Most of the rest of the time will be open to questions from the audience, as well as discussion among the panel members, focusing on lessons learned from this process, and recommendations to others who may consider doing something similar.

Evaluation as Quality Assurance: A Demonstration of the Profiling Program Quality Process Applied to Teacher Professional Development Programs
Demonstration Session 720 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Patricia S Bourexis, The Study Group Inc
Abstract
One of evaluation's roles in educational reform is to ensure that the programs comprising the reform reflect what we know to be effective from research and expert experience. Programs that reflect state-of-the-art knowledge in design and operation have the greatest likelihood of producing the systemic reforms underlying better outcomes for children. This session demonstrates a systems approach for using evaluation to assure the quality of one type of program frequently associated with systemic educational reform - teacher professional development programs. Profiling Program Quality has been adopted by several organizations engaged in teacher professional development. Profiling developers and users will demonstrate each step in the process with programs from the Teachers’ Academy for Mathematics and Science (TAMS) and then discuss with participants benefits and limitations of the approach, lessons learned, implications for evaluation practice, and applications of the approach to other types of education reform initiatives.

Evaluation of Community Level Health Promotion Programs
MultiPaper Session 721 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG
Chair Greg J Roberts, University of Texas at Austin

Evaluation Within Systems Reform: Strategies, Challenges, and Preliminary Findings
Presenters
Julienne Giard, University of South Florida
Katherine A Best, University of South Florida
Roger A Boothroyd, University of South Florida
Paul G Stiles, University of South Florida
Janet Suleski, University of South Florida

Abstract
This presentation will summarize evaluation design and preliminary findings examining the introduction of a behavioral health benefit in a County-sponsored health plan for the working poor. The evaluation contains three components. The first is an Implementation Analysis to describe the design and implementation of the behavioral healthcare model through the analysis of planning documents, contracts, and other materials detailing the goals, activities, timeframes, and anticipated outcomes and by a series of key-informant interviews conducted with stakeholders including network administrators, service providers, County personnel, and enrollees. The second component, a Population-Based Assessment, uses mail survey methodology to determine the prevalence of mental health and substance abuse needs among a representative sample of plan enrollees. The Service Users Assessment examines enrollees referred for behavioral health services to assess their mental health status and service utilization patterns and to determine the extent to which they comport to the project’s behavioral health disease management guidelines.

Process and Outcome Evaluation of The Children First Plan: A Three-year Pilot Program to Increase Effectiveness of The Service Delivery System for Children and Families
Presenters
Brenda K Klostermann, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Maria Britto, Children’s Hospital Medical Center
Thomas Chenier, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Mona Ho, University of Cincinnati
Geri Thelen, University of Cincinnati

Abstract
Past research has called for comprehensive and interagency programs that prevent fragmentation in services and reduce the chance of a child or family “following through the cracks.” The Children First (CF) Plan, a three-year, multi-faceted school-based intervention designed to increase the effectiveness of the service delivery system for children and families, focused on four objectives: decreasing school absences, high school dropouts, teen pregnancy, and the number of abused and neglected children. Process evaluation results, including key factors affecting implementation success, will be presented. The outcome evaluation used a pre-post non-equivalent group design using rate data (to account for school differences). Results indicated, among other things, school attendance and discipline indicators showed improvements, particularly at the elementary grades. Finally, dissemination of findings for multiple audiences to guide the continuation of the CF Plan will be discussed.

Evaluating Barriers to Utilizing a School-based Dental Sealant Program for At-risk Children
Presenters
Snigdha Mukherjee, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
Sanjana Bhardwaj, University of Alabama at Birmingham  
Ananda Dasanayake, New York University  
Noel Childers, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Abstract: The purpose of the current study is to identify the barriers to utilization of a school-based dental sealant program with the aim of modifying the program. A survey report of children with dental caries in Alabama (CDC) indicates that 63% have carious mixed dentition and 40% in the permanent dentition. Jefferson County Health Department, Alabama provides comprehensive care to all consenting children who are eligible for the free lunch program yet 55% of students in participating schools do not take the advantage of this service. Focus group discussions were conducted with teachers, participating and non-participating parents and children in schools covered by the program. Some major barriers were lack of stakeholder involvement, poor coordination between health department, schools and parents and among parents and children were uninformed about sealants. Recommendations made adding an educational component and involving teachers in program implementation.

Determining Health Programming Through a Multi-method Triennial Community Health Needs Assessment Process

Presenters: Susan J Hewitt, Poudre Health Services District  
Carol Plock, Poudre Health Services District  
Sacha Z Pampalone, Poudre Health Services District  
Bruce Cooper, Poudre Health Services District  
James N Burdine, Texas A&M University

Abstract: The Poudre Health Services District of Larimer County, Colorado has conducted a series of comprehensive community health needs assessments to guide programming, policy priorities, and targeting of resource allocations to have the most impact on the health of the community. The assessments, conducted in 1995, 1998, and 2001, combined quantitative random sample survey methodology (mean n=1500) and qualitative methods. Each time a series of community focus groups were held to collect qualitative input from residents and key informants. Quantitative measures included SF-12 scores, health status indicators, behavioral risk factors, access to care, readiness to change, and more, with trend analyses and estimations of potentially preventable health burdens. Local statistics were compared to state and national rates and to Healthy People 2010 goals. This session will review tools, methodologies, data analysis, and key findings, and will provide examples of policy decisions made as a result of the assessments over time.

Using Factor Analysis to Determine Construct Validity on a Student Evaluation of Faculty Instrument

Demonstration Session 722 to be held in the Prince William room  
Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG

Chair: Martin W Sivula, Johnson & Wales University

Presenters: Martin W Sivula, Johnson & Wales University  
Martha Rose, Johnson & Wales University

Abstract: A pilot study sample (n=1469) of undergraduate faculty was conducted, data analyzed, and results obtain in the spring of 2000. A full study population (n=10,365) of undergraduate faculty was then conducted in the fall of 2001. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients were calculated at .95 for the sample, and .95 for the population (using the same instrument). The pilot study data revealed five factors accounting for 91.7% of the total variance of the instrument, whereas the full study revealed six factors explaining 96.9% of the total variance. Scree plots of the eigenvalues conferred with factor loading values on the retaining of factors. Four of the six constructs (factors) are named with the descriptor ‘student’ indicating the relative importance of students in the assessment. It is concluded that factor analysis is useful to evaluate construct existence on student evaluation of faculty instruments.
Using Benchmarks in Higher Education for Improvement and Accountability

Panel Session 724 to be held in Ballroom A
Sponsored by the Assessment in Higher Education TIG
Chair: Mark E. Troy, Texas A&M University
Discussant: Michael Scriven, Claremont Graduate University
Session Abstract: National rankings of colleges and universities by college guides and the media have been called into question for their methodology and their utility. This panel reviews a different approach, the National Survey of Student Engagement which provides benchmarks of educational effectiveness and quality of learning. The NSSE proposes that the benchmarks can serve to 1) Identify colleges and universities where students are highly engaged in certain educational practices; 2) Determine if an institution is performing better or worse than expected; 3) Estimate an institution's overall effectiveness; 4) Discover distinctive patterns in the undergraduate experience. The value of these benchmarks for institutional improvement, accountability, and public information will be examined from the point of view of the universities and accrediting agencies.

Benchmarking and University Strategic Planning
Presenter: Mark E. Troy, Texas A&M University
Abstract: Texas A&M is a large, state-supported, land-grant university with a decentralized administrative structure. As with other institutions, Texas A&M faces increased pressure from the public and the legislature to attract good students and to demonstrate the quality of education they receive. Recently our president has set a goal of being ranked among the top 10 public institutions in the nation by the year 2020. Recognizing that our strength as an institution is in the undergraduate experience, the university has turned to the NSSE for appropriate benchmarks. This paper will discuss how NSSE benchmarks are incorporated into the university strategic planning.

Unraveling the Complex Intersections in Benchmarking: Reliability, Validity and Decision-making in Higher Education
Presenter: Kathy M. Girton, University of Utah
Abstract: Benchmarking is often viewed optimistically as an appropriate means for assessing the vitality of practices, or programs, on higher education campuses. Benchmarking is usefully considered as a conceptual approach for organizing discussions, researching comparative data, and conducting evaluation studies. The challenge to this view is that benchmarking does not represent a single method, or unified topic. It is not one type of analysis. Performance benchmarking, process benchmarking and strategic benchmarking are just a few of the approaches that Evaluators adopt in the conduct of their work. The complexity of benchmarking practices reside in the details of their frameworks. Each faces the challenge of rigor in reliability and validity. Each hinders or supports effective decision-making. This presentation attempts to unravel the internal complexity of benchmarking by asking specific questions about reliability, validity and decision-making of the NSSE survey instrument.

Benchmarking and Institutional Accreditation: Welcoming Serious Evaluation to Campus
Presenter: Mandana Hashemzadeh, Claremont Graduate University
Abstract: If to accredit an institution of higher learning is to ascertain its educational effectiveness and organizational integrity, then [naturally] the accrediting process via which such conclusions are reached ought to exhibit a rigorous systematic evaluation. Part of this systematic approach would be to examine the college/university environments--within and without the typical bounds of the entity--to explore and identify functional equivalents with respect to both educational offerings and institutional processes leading to such outcomes, i.e., intra- and inter-institutional benchmarking. To inform this activity, accrediting bodies may opt to employ already available national data such as those of NSSE or create some other vehicle to determine the scope of competitors and detect those significant among them.

Improving the College Experience: National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice
Presenter: John Hayek, Indiana University
Abstract: The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) annually collects information directly from undergraduate students that colleges and universities can use to improve student learning. NSSE results challenge the view of college quality popularized by national news magazines, which rate colleges largely on the basis of resources and reputation. NSSE's database includes more than 225,000 students at 620 different four-year colleges and universities. The survey results provide comparative benchmarks for determining how effectively colleges are contributing to learning in five areas: 1) academic challenge; 2) active and collaborative learning; 3) student-faculty interaction; 4) enriching educational experiences; and 5) supportive campus environment. Schools use NSSE data to facilitate national and sector benchmarking efforts, improve undergraduate education, and inform state accountability and accreditation efforts. NSSE is supported by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts and cosponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of...
**National Agenda to Transform Teaching with Technology: Evaluation Roles and Strategies**

Panel Session 725 to be held in Ballroom B

Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG

Chair: Donna M Mertens, Gallaudet University

Session Abstract: The U.S. Department of Education has awarded grants to over 150 universities and consortia to improve teacher use of technology under its PT3 Initiative (Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers for Technology). The purpose of this panel is to present and discuss the roles of evaluation in this national agenda to create systemic change in the way teaching is performed, as well as to demonstrate a variety of resources and approaches for evaluation in the context of technological applications. The panel will consist of presentations by four evaluators who are working with the PT3 - L3, Learning, Linking, and Leading catalyst grant. Working in partnership with AEA, this grant is designed to assist evaluators in increasing the capacity for evaluation to be used as a catalyst for technology-based preservice systemic reform and support this capacity through the sharing of knowledge, use of strategic planning, and leveraging existing resources.

**Successful Integration of Technology in Teaching Through Systemic Change**

Presenter: Kathy Garvin-Doxas, University of Colorado at Boulder

Abstract: Successful integration of technology in teaching requires that faculty and administrators be persuaded to implement institutional changes that support the use of new technological tools. In this portion of the panel, we will discuss the issues such as the culture of autonomy and independence; the tenure and promotion system; and resistance and beliefs about technology in higher education which often erect barriers the integration of technology in classroom teaching. We will also discuss the use of the evaluation process as a catalyst for systemic change that promotes the successful integration of technology in classrooms by providing faculty (and administrators) with “good reasons” for changing the way they teach.

**Sharing Evaluation Resources as a Catalyst for Preservice Transformations**

Presenter: Jayne W James, University of Kansas

Abstract: The Resources and Strategies Data Base will be demonstrated in this session and reflects the work of the PT3 community. This database was constructed as part of the PT3 - L3 Project as a portfolio accessible through the web to allow evaluators access to a wide-range of existing tools and procedures related to technology use in education. The work within this collection is defined by utility and topic area and offers resources in the following formats: Web-Based Resources, Streamed Media, Downloadable Files, and Physical Media - ways to connect with a variety of materials that are not online: CDs, DVDs, Video or Audio Tapes and Books or Brochures.

**Integrating GPRA Indicators and ISTE/NETS Standards: Implications for Evaluation**

Presenter: Donna M Mertens, Gallaudet University

Abstract: Based on a review of the evaluation strategies and tools that have been used nation-wide in the PT3 Initiative, this presentation will examine implications for data collection to facilitate responsiveness to the GPRA indicators. However, given the temporal nature of the GPRA Indicators, it is also necessary to examine their relationship to the ISTE/NETS standards. The presentation will discuss this relationship in terms of its implications for sustainability beyond the PT3 funding period, as well as for the need for mixed methods of data collection in order to capture the complexity of technology-based projects. Ideas for evaluation will be presented based on field work with faculty who have been successful in using the PT3 grant to increase their own and their students’ technological proficiency.

**Qualitative Approaches to Evaluating Technology Preparation of Preservice Teachers**

Presenters: Catherine E Brawner, Research Triangle Educational Consultants

Rebecca Brent, Education Designs Incorporated

Pamela Van Dyk, State University of North Carolina

Abstract: This presentation will report findings from case studies of student teachers and focus groups with students preparing to enter the professional semester at North Carolina State University. NC State’s MentorNet is in its final year of an implementation grant under the Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology grant program. Among the goals of MentorNet is to improve the understanding and use of Information Technology in the classroom by pre-service teachers. After trying a number of evaluation methods, we have found that in-depth case studies of student teachers and focus groups with pre-service teachers provides us with the best understanding of the impact of MentorNet activities. This presentation will address the evaluation methods and findings regarding university preparation and clinical intern teaching practices over the three year period of the grant.
Evaluating University Research, Joint Ventures, and Technology Transfer

MultiPaper Session 727 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Research, Technology, and Development Evaluation TIG
Chair: Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University

Advanced Technology Program Information Infrastructure for Healthcare: Case Studies from a Focused Program

Presenters: Nicholas S Vonortas, George Washington University; Richard Spivack, National Institute of Standards and Technology

Abstract: This paper appraises in some detail four large research joint ventures selected for support by the Information Infrastructure for Healthcare (IIH) focused program of NIST’s Advanced Technology Program in the second half of the 1990s. These joint ventures worked in parallel (but independently) on the development of information infrastructure for health enterprises and emergent community health systems as well as on the appropriate tools to support such infrastructure. They, however, pursued their objectives with strikingly different organizational structures. Based on extensive review of the available documents and a large number of personal interviews, this recount analyzes the incentives to create these research joint ventures, the way they operated, perceived success and failure factors, and the role of the ATP in setting them up and maintaining momentum. The findings of the paper can assist ATP (and other government agencies) in evaluating the organizational aspects of research joint ventures they support.

Conceptual Framework for the Evaluation of University Research in Europe

Presenter: David FJ Campbell, Institute for Advanced Studies

Abstract: The focus concentrates on the evaluation of university research (academic basic research) in Europe. Empirically, mainly four countries will be covered: the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria. First, a conceptual typology of the quality dimensions of university research will be offered and discussed. There should be a distinction between “first-level” and “second-level” quality dimensions. Criteria for the first level are: quality, efficiency, relevance, and viability. Criteria for the second dimension are: effectiveness, organizational improvement, evolutionary quality increase, and co-evolution of research and research evaluation. Second, the function of university research can be, conceptually differentiated: (1) creating an environment with consequences (feedback) and/or (2) stimulating and supporting self-organizational learning processes. Finally, the potential conceptual interaction between different quality dimensions and different evaluation functions should be addressed.

Evaluating Technology Transfer: A Case Study in Technology for Persons with Disabilities

Presenters: Vathsala I Stone, State University of New York at Buffalo; Joseph P Lane, State University of New York at Buffalo

Abstract: This paper presents the methodology and findings of a study that is validating an innovative approach to technology transfer (Lane, 1999) at the University at Buffalo. It is part of a federally funded program to transfer needed technologies and products into the marketplace for persons with disabilities. It focuses on formative and summative evaluation of the outcomes as well as the feasibility, effectiveness and efficiency of the processes. Stakeholder involvement is fundamental to the model. The operating model is judged against the proposed model, rather than against an external model. Design validity is improved by providing a causal chain (Scriven, 1976; Mohr, 1998) through intermediate outcomes. Quantitative and qualitative data generate case studies that report on the validated model version. Findings include outcomes (transferred technologies and devices), their time to success/failure and effort expended in the transfer. We also describe the barriers encountered and the best practices established.

Appreciative Inquiry and Evaluation: Reframing Evaluation Practice

Panel Session 728 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Chair: Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Discussant: Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University

Session Abstract: This panel will explore how the theory and practice of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) can be applied to the field of evaluation. AI is a new approach to inquiry from the field of organizational development, which enables an organization to reconceptualize its purpose, principles and design in positive and ‘life-giving’ ways (Watkins and Mohr, 2000). In this panel we will present a brief theoretical overview of AI that will be followed by three presentations discussing how AI was used in conducting different evaluation studies. The discussant will present a critical analysis that identifies the issues evaluators should consider when applying AI to evaluation and the broader significance of an appreciative approach to the field of evaluation.

Overview of Appreciative Inquiry and Evaluation

Presenters: Ana Coghlan, Peace Corps; Hallie Preskill, University of New Mexico
Abstract To start the panel, we will describe and define Appreciative Inquiry and then explore the shortcomings of different evaluation approaches, the potential uses of Appreciative Inquiry in evaluation, and the possible advantages and disadvantages of using Appreciative Inquiry as an approach to evaluation. By enabling programs to discover and then build on their successes, an appreciative approach to evaluation moves programs toward their highest aspirations and best practices. An AI evaluation process also provides ongoing and continuous opportunities to look back and build on those moments of excellence. However, there may be several challenges to using AI in evaluation. Because some people see AI only as an organizational development activity, they may question if the inquiry is evaluation at all. Others might be concerned that such an inquiry would present a biased picture of the program and that it would fail to identify and address any problems within the program.

Appreciative Program Evaluation: Shifting Our Focus from Shortcomings to Value

Presenters Sheila McNamee, University of New Hampshire
Karen Hicks, University of New Hampshire

Abstract I will describe an evaluation of a Learning Circle gathered together to explore the notion of social capital (Putnam, 2001) across the state of New Hampshire. The central premise of social capital is that social networks have value. Social capital refers to the collective value of all associational networks [who people know] and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other [norms of reciprocity] (Putnam, 2001). In order to evaluate the success and utility of the Learning Circle, an evaluation process based on Appreciative Inquiry is being designed and implemented. Traditional evaluation processes often leave us with a sense of what is not working and what needs to be improved. By merging Appreciative Inquiry with program evaluation, we can construct new and generative ways of developing and implementing effective programs. This is the focus of Appreciative evaluation, which will be further discussed in this presentation.

Coming to Appreciative Inquiry as an Evaluative Tool

Presenters Dawn Hanson Smart, The Evaluation Forum
Mariann Mann, Clegg & Associates

Abstract Girl Scouts Beyond Bars (GSBB) is a scouting program serving daughters of women inmates, a collaboration between the Washington Corrections Center for Women (WCCW) and two Girl Scouts Councils in western Washington. The program is based on a national model proposing that girls participate in challenging, learning activities with peers, and receive appropriate guidance and emotional support from adults, to reduce the likelihood of future involvement in criminal behavior. In year three of a three-year evaluation, Appreciative Inquiry was used in an attempt to capture more useful information about the relationship between program activities and participant outcomes. We needed more sensitive, discriminating data and more constructive indicators that could demonstrate program success and where improvement was needed. We will discuss the extent to which using an Appreciative Inquiry approach achieved these goals.

Evaluation of the International Women’s Media Foundation Africa Program

Presenters Tessie T Catsambas, EnCompass LLC
Laverne Dees Webb, EnCompass LLC

Abstract EnCompass LLC was invited by the International Women’s Media Foundation (IWMF), to design and implement an evaluation of the Africa Women’s Media Center (AWMC) headquartered in Senegal, West Africa. Its purpose was to promote women in news media in leadership roles, provide networking opportunities for professional support and development, provide access to education and specific skills training resources and opportunities, and to enhance the leadership potential of African women in news media to promote news coverage of issues affecting women and society. The IWMF was concerned that the evaluation process and results have credibility, while ensuring that the evaluators also remain sensitive to the organization’s needs and realities. The use of an appreciative approach to evaluation will be described. The following issues will also be addressed: (a) the role of the evaluator and the relationship with the organization; (b) client resistance; and (c) appreciative evaluation as intervention.

How Do I Pilot this Thing? A Hands On Interactive Session on Piloting Evaluation Instruments

Skill-building Workshop Session 729 to be held in Ballroom F
Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG
Chair Nancy Grudens-Schuck, Iowa State University
Presenters Nancy Grudens-Schuck, Iowa State University
Juliann Cramer, Iowa State University
Brett Kramer, Iowa State University

Abstract Did you know that having colleagues “look over” the draft of your evaluation survey instrument isn’t good enough? In fact, mistaking the “peer check” for the process of piloting a draft survey instrument or interview guide can make the process of gathering data worse! Attend this hands on,
interactive session to learn WHY it is important to pilot an instrument, and WHAT defines "piloting." Through exercises with real surveys, learn piloting skills that are cheap, fast, convenient, and reliable. BRING your draft survey to get help deciding WHICH stakeholders to involve in piloting, and WHAT information can be expected from this process. CONTRIBUTE techniques you use to pilot by sharing during open discussion. Beginners and intermediate skill levels welcome. The session will focus on programs in extension education and environmental education.

Evaluating K-12 Education Policies
MultiPaper Session 731 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Kentucky District and School Coordinators' Evaluation of Their Extended School Services Programs
Presenters: Merrill L Mehan, Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc
Kimberly S Cowley, Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc
Nicole Finch, Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc
Jennifer Blake, Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc
Abstract: As part of a comprehensive evaluation of KentuckyÆs Extended School Services (ESS) program for at-risk students, the first stage was to discover the district and school coordinatorsÆ perceptions of their programs. One hundred fifty-one (84% return rate) district ESS coordinator and 837 (59% return rate) school ESS coordinator surveys were analyzed. The responses showed that the ESS program is viewed positively in terms of helping to address the needs of students who are at-risk academically. Further, there is agreement among coordinators regarding funding preferences for strengths of, challenges to, and improvements needed in their respective ESS programs. Recommendations focused on transportation, teacher salaries, number of ESS teachers, professional development, communications, funding preferences, student motivation, and best practices.

Evaluation of California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST): Report on the 2001 Box Review
Presenters: Pamela L Paek, Educational Testing Service
Marnie Thompson, Educational Testing Service
Abstract: The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) is a two-year structured professional development program for California beginning teachers that is widely used across the state. CFASST provides a series of formative assessment tasks based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The system includes inquiry and observation, focusing the beginning teacher on critical aspects of teaching. A central component of CFASST is the beginning teacher’s collection of evidence, called the CFASST Box, which contains directions for a series of inquiry-based activities and accompanying "forms," which the beginning teachers and support providers fill out in the course of completing the activities. This report describes the analysis of 140 boxes purposely sampled from the state and its major research findings. Some findings discussed include issues in rater effects, the quality and level of beginning teacher reflection, and the quality and level of support received.

Analyses in Support of Stronger Evaluations
MultiPaper Session 732 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Modeling Variability in Multi-site Evaluation Studies Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM): Meta-analytic Perspective
Presenters: Sema A Kalaian, University of Toledo
Rafa M Kasim, EMT Associates Inc
Abstract: Most of the social and behavioral Science literature focus on the mean differences in performance between treatment groups. This focus offers a narrow and limited view of the potential treatment effects on performance. In many policy research instances, differences in performance variances between treatment groups should be considered another commonly reported and substantively important outcome measure of the effect of an intervention. For example, head start preschool programs could have dual objectives: one is to improve average performance and the other is to achieve equity among children the improved performance. That is reducing heterogeneity on performance among children. This study (a) presents methods for applying meta-analytic techniques to estimate the dispersion treatment effects from large-scale multi-site evaluation studies; (b) Uses Hierarchical linear model to find the Empirical Bayes estimates of the fixed and random parameters; (c) Models the heterogeneity in these dispersion treatment effects as a function of site characteristics; and (d) Applies the proposed methodology to real multilevel evaluation data.

Web-based Data Collection: Factors Affecting the Process and Methodologies to Improve the Validity and Reliability of Results
Presenter: Eduardo A Molina, St Louis University
Findings indicated that innovative approaches were needed in providing services in rural areas. Approaches used by the grantees depended largely on the ecological model, which includes social and cultural norms, institutional policies and practices, linkages between systems, social networks, and individuals.

Program, COSMOS Corporation conducted an outcome evaluation with nine programs funded to establish or enhance services in remote areas. Using a logic model approach and the "learning through principled discovery" approach to evaluation (Marks et al., 2000). The logic model goes beyond the simple comparison of "others" category. Ultimately, the findings from this evaluation can be fed back to the program development process to help sharpen goals and objectives to improve services to clients. The unique contribution of this evaluation is its use of the Logic Model. The logic model goes beyond the simple comparison of the program theory with its observed outcome. By explicating the program theory, assumptions, services needed, and the stakeholders the evaluation is support. The findings showed that 29 women acquired resolving all their legal issues, 21 women did not resolve their issues and 100 women fell in the above. For the purpose of this study, the three legal issues under Temporary Restraining Orders addressed were: Resraint, custody of children and child support. The findings showed that 29 women acquired resolving all their legal issues, 21 women did not resolve their issues and 100 women fell in the "others" category. Ultimately, the findings from this evaluation can be fed back to the program development process to help sharpen goals and objectives to improve services to clients. The unique contribution of this evaluation is its use of the Logic Model. The logic model goes beyond the simple comparison of the program theory with its observed outcome. By explicating the program theory, assumptions, services needed, and the stakeholders the evaluation is forced to consider the links between these components (real or missing). These process creates an iterative feedback loop that informs practice as well as evaluation. Ultimately, improving the overall operation of the program. Still new to the field of evaluation, the Logic Model is gaining wide acceptance in human service evaluation (e.g. United Way). In this evaluation, the researcher was able to identify critical gaps in specifications of goals and objectives, as well as program implementation.

**Fulfilling Expectations: Feminist Perspective on Shaping Evaluations to Accommodate the Human Factor**

MultiPaper Session 733 to be held in the Potomac II room

Sponsored by the Feminist Issues in Evaluation TIG

Chair: Stanley J Capela, Heartshare Human Services

Discussant: Stanley J Capela, Heartshare Human Services

**A Program Evaluation: The Effect of Legal Advocacy on Behalf of Victims of Domestic Violence**

Presenter: Njoki Randall, Morris Brown College

Abstract: This outcome evaluation measured the resolution rates of Temporary Protective Orders of women involved in domestic violence. The sample consisted of 150 case files of women who received assistance between July 2000 and July 2002. The sample included all women aged 18 years and above. For the purpose of this study, the three legal issues under Temporary Restraining Orders addressed were: Resraint, custody of children and child support. The findings showed that 29 women acquired resolving all their legal issues, 21 women did not resolve their issues and 100 women fell in the "others" category. Ultimately, the findings from this evaluation can be fed back to the program development process to help sharpen goals and objectives to improve services to clients. The unique contribution of this evaluation is its use of the Logic Model. The logic model goes beyond the simple comparison of the program theory with its observed outcome. By explicating the program theory, assumptions, services needed, and the stakeholders the evaluation is forced to consider the links between these components (real or missing). These process creates an iterative feedback loop that informs practice as well as evaluation. Ultimately, improving the overall operation of the program. Still new to the field of evaluation, the Logic Model is gaining wide acceptance in human service evaluation (e.g. United Way). In this evaluation, the researcher was able to identify critical gaps in specifications of goals and objectives, as well as program implementation.

**The Role of Context in Evaluating Rural Domestic Violence Programs**

Presenters: Aileen E Worrrell, COSMOS Corporation

Mary Ann Dutton, Georgetown University Medical Center

Abstract: As part of its evaluation of the U.S. Department of Justice's Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant Program, COSMOS Corporation conducted an outcome evaluation with nine programs funded to establish or enhance services in remote areas. Using a nested ecological model within a case study design, evaluators assessed the measurable impact of the programs with outcomes defined by levels of a nested ecological model, which includes social and cultural norms, institutional policies and practices, linkages between systems, social networks, and individuals. Findings indicated that innovative approaches were needed in providing services in rural areas. Approaches used by the grantees depended largely on the
social context in which they existed. This context, in turn, influenced the identification of outcomes, indicators, and data collection methods used by the evaluators.

Building Juvenile Justice Evaluation Capacity in the States
Panel Session 734 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Crime and J ustice TIG
Chair: Stan Orchowsky, J ustice Research and Statistics Association

Session Abstract: The J ustice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is a national organization whose constituents are state Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs). SACs are government entities that are responsible for justice system research and evaluation in their states. JRSA has been working with the Office of J ustice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) on a project designed to enhance states’ capacities to evaluate their juvenile justice programs. As part of this effort, JRSA funds evaluation partnership projects between SACs and state juvenile justice administrators that are designed to establish working relationships between the two. This session features presentations from three SAC partnership projects. These projects, conducted by the SACs in Illinois, Iowa, and Maine, demonstrate the range of activities that have been funded under this initiative. The SACs will discuss the findings of their evaluation projects and how these projects have contributed to juvenile justice evaluation capacity building in their states.

Maine’s Evaluation Partnership Project:
Presenter: Elizabeth Martin, Maine Statistical Analysis Center
Abstract: In 1999 Maine received a grant to build the capacity of the J ustice Advisory Group (JJAG) and its grantees in performance measurement. The major accomplishments of this initial grant were: 1) A revised RFP format and grant application guide, and 2) Training for JJAG members in performance government and evaluation. As a result of this work and ongoing technical assistance, the JJAG improved its capacity to make decisions about funding and grantees became accountable for evaluation plans directed toward outcomes as well as outputs. Through a subsequent grant and a continuing partnership between the JJAG and the Muskie School for Public Service, we provided training in performance government and evaluation to potential grantees. As a result of the training and direct technical assistance for grantees, we see a marked improvement in proposals and grantees’ capacity to develop evaluation plans. Additionally, this makes more data available to assist the JJAG in its long range planning process.

Enhancing Collaboration and Juvenile Justice Evaluation Capacity in Illinois
Presenters: Phillip Stevenson, Illinois Criminal J ustice Information Authority
Timothy Lavery, Illinois Criminal J ustice Information Authority
Tracy Hahn, Illinois Criminal J ustice Information Authority

Abstract: This presentation will focus on two initiatives aimed at enhancing juvenile justice evaluation capacity through a collaboration of Illinois’ Statistical Analysis Center and State J ustice A dvisory Group. In September of 2000, the Illinois Criminal J ustice Information Authority (the Authority) received a J ustice Evaluation Partnership grant from the Office of J ustice and Delinquency Prevention, through the J ustice Research and Statistics Association. This grant supported work on a “J ustice J ouncil Guidebook and Evaluation Manual.” J ustice J ouncils were recently authorized by statute encouraging Illinois counties to put together a collaborative group of juvenile justice professionals to work together to address the juvenile delinquency problems in their counties. This grant gave the Authority an opportunity to assist juvenile justice councils meet their responsibilities and encourage the use of evaluation to measure the success of their efforts. In addition, a second grant supported the development of a database to support annual county-level monitoring of disproportionate minority representation rates at multiple stages of the juvenile justice system and the creation of juvenile justice system profiles for all 102 counties in Illinois. Among other data elements, these profiles include indicators of disproportionate minority representation at multiple stages of their local juvenile justice system. How these initiatives enhanced collaboration and juvenile justice evaluation capacity at the local level will be the focus of this presentation.

Iowa’s Juvenile Justice Evaluation Capacity Building Efforts
Presenters: David Huff, Iowa Criminal and J ustice Planning
Richard Moore, Iowa Criminal and J ustice Planning

Abstract: The JRSA funding specifically allowed the Iowa Division of Criminal and J ustice Planning (JCJ P) to provide assistance to a local outcomes effort (conducted by the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice) and improve Iowa’s juvenile justice youth development grant outcomes. Through the JRSA grant program, JCJ P has developed a protocol and process to capture and use outcome-based data from the juvenile justice youth development grantees organized around five result areas identified by the Iowa Collaboration for Y outh Development (ICYD). The five result areas include: (1) families are secure and supportive, (2) communities and schools are safe and supportive, (3) youth are engaged in and contribute to the community, (4) youth are healthy and socially competent, and (5) youth are successful in school and prepared for a productive adulthood. These efforts have
been viewed as very positive and worthwhile in enhancing juvenile justice evaluation capacity building and improving juvenile justice outcome information.

Untapped Potential: Evaluation Within the Context of Historically Black Colleges

Multipaper Session 735 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chair: Denise Wright, Howard University

Overcoming Mis-education: Evaluation in the Context of Historically Black Colleges/Institutions

Presenter: Sarita Davis, Clark Atlanta University
Abstract: This paper presentation describes the three-year process of developing an evaluation agenda among a consortium of Historically Black Colleges/Institutions. The paper begins with an overview of the evaluation project, the Symposium on Careers in the Biomedical Sciences - SCOBS. Next, data on three years of process, outcome, and impact findings are presented. The paper explores the role of systemic contexts in framing the evaluation questions, the selection of evaluation methods, and ultimately the use of the evaluation findings in informing the project as well as the agenda of the consortium.

Evaluators Right Under Our Noses: The Wealth of Untapped Potential at Our Modern Day Historically Black Institutions

Presenter: Aisha K Tucker-Brown, University of Georgia
Abstract: This presentation initiate a critical dialogue about the paucity of recruitment for evaluation professionals among students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The purpose of this paper is to explore ways to increase the participation of African Americans in the field of evaluation by tapping into the historically untapped pool of students attending HBCUs. In an effort to increase racial and ethnic diversity in the field of evaluation it seems a logical step to reach out to up and coming minority professionals where they exist in abundance, HBCUs. By not making a concerted effort to tap into the rich potential at these institutions, the field of evaluation will continue to overlook a vital source of diversity.

Young People's Participation in Evaluating Programs and Places

Panel Session 736 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair: Louise Chawla, Kentucky State University
Session Abstract: This panel reflects on theory and practice in engaging children and youth in participatory evaluations of their living environments and the institutions and programs that serve them. It covers three related areas. How can projects provide for innovative methods in young people's evaluation of their environments, while collecting reliable information that can be used to inform policy and planning? How can sociocultural theory in psychology help practitioners understand the components of participatory evaluations that contribute to youth development? How can programs be designed to foster youth gains in environmental concern and activism, and how have these gains been measured? The panelists will address these questions and invite audience discussion.

Young People's Participation in Community Evaluation

Presenter: David Driskell, Cornell University
Abstract: The Growing Up in Cities project is a global effort to involve young people in the processes of community evaluation, decision making, and action. The project has engaged young people in evaluating their local environmental quality in over a dozen sites around the world, spanning cultures in both the North and the South. The presentation will provide an overview of the methods used to involve young people in evaluation activities; examples of adaptations of the methods that were used at various sites to ensure their effectiveness within the local setting or cultural context while maintaining rigor; and a brief summary of the project's initial findings and subsequent activities. The presentation will conclude with an overview of the barriers and opportunities for young people's participation in community evaluation based on the experiences in the initial Growing Up in Cities sites.

Youth Lead Evaluation: A Performatory Activity

Presenter: Kim Sabo, Kim Sabo Consulting
Abstract: This presentation explores Youth Development (YD) and Youth Lead Evaluation (YLE) practices to better understand: 1) the relationship between them; and 2) the extent to which they are developmental for the youth involved. A sociocultural understanding of development is introduced in the analysis of these practices. An overview of this understanding will be presented, including its roots in the work of Lev Vygotsky. Vygotsky understood development as a sociocultural joint activity that occurs when children are supported to perform beyond their standard level of development. This presentation reframes YD and YLE in terms of performatory activity. It argues that YD and YLE approaches support young people to perform in new and
varied roles (e.g., evaluators, researchers, experts, presenters, interviewers, data analysts) that are in advance of their normal current level, and in the process foster their intellectual, emotional and social development. Performatory environments of this kind, it concludes, are essential for optimal development.

Evaluating Changes in Young People's Environmental Concern

Presenter: Louise Chawla, Kentucky State University

Abstract: Many community youth development projects focus on identifying and addressing local environmental issues, with the desired outcome of increasing young people’s knowledge and concern about the environment and their readiness to take action to protect it. This presentation reviews three bodies of research that are relevant to these goals: (a) significant life experience studies that identify childhood experiences which adults claim motivated their environmental activism; studies with young people themselves regarding the factors associated with high levels of environmental concern and responsible action; and evaluations of projects to increase young people’s involvement in protecting and improving local places. Based on research results, the presentation recommends how to design participatory projects that will be most likely to increase young people’s care and action on behalf of their environment, and how to evaluate whether these outcomes occur.

Evaluating National Service: Civic Engagement and Formative Experiences During Emergent Adulthood

MultiPaper Session 737 to be held in the Potomac VI room

Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee

Chair: Marcia Scott, Corporation for National and Community Service

The Cross-cultural Legacy of Generation X: Generation X Speaks Out on Contemporary Civic and Government Engagement, Identity and Social Trust

Presenter: Melinda L. Crowley, US Census Bureau

Abstract: This presentation is guided by an assumption that responsiveness to government-sponsored initiatives (e.g., AmeriCorps, the decennial census, joining the military) is in part motivated by an individual’s sense of civic responsibility. According to media rhetoric, Generation Xers (defined as individuals born during the years 1968-1979) want little to do with government, are cynical and detached, and shun civic responsibilities and commitments. This presentation examines how GenXers value, define, organize and view civic & government engagement, assesses factors influencing attitudes toward engagement, discusses barriers to civic & government engagement, and the correlation between various cultural value systems and specific behavioral engagement patterns. Most GenX research and commentary relates to a racially and socioeconomically narrow group, but this presentation focuses on historically underserved GenX minority populations who have had no clear place in the discourse on civic and government engagement to date.

Differential Paths to Development of Motivations for Civic Engagement

Presenters: Lance Potter, Corporation for National and Community Service
             JoAnn Intilli, Aguirre International
             Marcia Scott, Corporation for National and Community Service

Assessment of Civic Engagement Behaviors and Attitudes Among AmeriCorps Members: Implications for Community Service Programming

Presenters: JoAnn Jastrzab, Abt Associates Inc
            Leanne Giordono, Abt Associates Inc
            Dawn Obeidallah-Davis, Abt Associates Inc

Developing Engaged Citizens: Evaluating an Experiment in Training

Presenters: Adrienne von Glatz, Westat
            William Strang, Westat

Best Practice Reviews of Florida’s School Districts: A Reforming Process to Improve School District Management and Use of Resources

Panel Session 738 to be held in the Conference Theater room

Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG and the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG

Chair: Kathleen Del Monte, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

Session Abstract: In 1996 the Florida legislature adopted an innovative system of Best Financial Management Practice Reviews designed to help school districts meet the challenge of educating their students in a cost-effective manner. These reviews compare a district’s management and operational activities to statewide ‘best practices’ for school districts and are easily transferable to other states and policy areas. A major aim of these evaluations is to encourage
systemic reform of a local school district’s programs and to determine whether major programs are meeting the intended purpose in a cost-effective manner. This presentation will address how the review process helps school districts improve their operations and accountability mechanisms through the use of a self-assessment, on-site reviews, and collaborative development of action plans. In addition, the presentation will provide information on the results of district reviews with an emphasis on how districts have responded to recommendations for systemic change in the local environment.

**Best Practices: Background and Process**

**Presenter**  
Jane Fletcher, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

**Abstract**  
The Best Practices Review is an evaluation tool designed to improve a school district’s management, operations, and use of resources. Created to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of school districts, they are designed to improve public confidence that school districts are using public funds efficiently and wisely. The Best Practices system began in 1997 with OPPAGA conducting an extensive literature review and consulting with a wide variety of educational stakeholders including more than half of Florida’s school districts, universities, professional organizations, and the departments of education in Florida and other states. In addition we sought input from various stakeholders who represent the public’s interest in education including legislative staff, the Governor’s Office, chambers of commerce, and “good government” groups. This presentation provides a retrospective on the evolution of the Best Practices, how and why the Reviews were developed, and the actual processes used in conducting the Best Practice Reviews.

**Best Practices: Findings and Follow-up**

**Presenter**  
Martha Wellman, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

**Abstract**  
In conducting a Best Practices Review, we take a comprehensive approach, looking at over 450 indicators of some 200 best practices in 13 areas of school district operations. In this presentation, we outline the thirteen areas reviewed with examples of best practices in each area and indicators examined within those best practices. We then provide an overview of some of the findings which have emerged from the reviews and present some of the more commonly followed best practices. We also describe the follow-up reviews of districts that have been the subject of Best Practice Reviews, discussing their level of success in implementing the recommendations. Finally, we outline some of the cost savings that have been realized as a result of districts’ implementation of recommendations and whether the management and operations of the districts reviewed have improved.

**Best Practices: Working with Contractors**

**Presenter**  
Kathleen Del Monte, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

**Abstract**  
Best Practice Reviews can be conducted either by OPPAGA staff or in cooperation with consultants. In this presentation, we provide an overview of some of the advantages of contracting, such as providing a fresh perspective, easing the workload, and acquiring specialized expertise. We also present some of the disadvantages, including higher cost per hour, less control over the work, and selecting the entity that will be held accountable for the final product. In addition, we describe the actual RFP process and offer important points about establishing a partnership with the contractor. Finally, we share some of the more important lessons learned in the process of working with contractors, such as being explicit about the roles and responsibilities of each of the players, having clear expectations for deliverables (including content, quality and timelines), and payment of fees.

**Best Practices: Re-sharpening the Tool for Systemic Reform**

**Presenter**  
Yvonne Bigos, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

**Abstract**  
In this presentation, we describe what we have learned about improving the Review process. We discuss the need for constant communication among team members and the importance of consistency in staffing. In addition, we explain how we apply a continuous improvement model, refining and improving our systems. For example, the initial Best Practices Reviews called for attention to 10 practice areas. In an effort to be more comprehensive, the Best Practices Reviews were subsequently expanded to include two new practice areas. Finally, we relate how we are currently in the process of re-evaluating the indicators used to assess whether or not districts are meeting best practices, attempting to refine the indicators and streamline the process. We have learned, for example, that some indicators are far more critical to success than others and we are striving to encourage school districts to move beyond compliance to truly exemplary practices.
management consultant or a technical assistance specialist in helping to put these and other aspects of systems reform in place. This session will explore some of the ramifications of this blurring of roles from the perspectives of funder and evaluator.

**A Funder's Perspective: When Do We Evaluate the Evaluator? and Other Thorny Questions**

*Presenter*: Teresa R Behrens, WK Kellogg Foundation  
*Abstract*: Especially within its strategic initiatives, the WKKF has placed increasing emphasis on outcome assessment. Grantees are being asked to report on specific outcomes, which may involve tracking individuals across service delivery systems. The need for community wide data can become a driver to create new collaborations and lead to systems change. This presents several challenges for foundation funders. How should the evaluation and technical assistance be managed? Are the efforts that evaluators make in today’s world in terms of data collection different from the past? Are new areas of overlapping or blurring of functions developing? Should the role of evaluators be considered part of the logic model of change and if so, what does this imply? How does the evaluation function relate to the Foundation program staff and evaluation staff? This presentation will explore these questions and offer some preliminary guidelines.

**The Evaluators' Perspective: Formative and Summative Evaluation Revisited**

*Presenter*: Ying Ying Yuan, Walter R McDonald & Associates  
*Abstract*: This presentation will explore the dynamics of the relationships among evaluator, grantees, foundation program staff, and foundation evaluation staff from the perspective of a multi-site cluster evaluator of two foundation initiatives where the process of obtaining evaluation data became part of the change strategy. Whether these new directions result in new challenges to evaluation, or are reflections of the constant tug between formative evaluation and summative evaluation will be explored. Issues such as the role of the evaluator in capacity development, identification of data sources, assessment of data quality, and design of data capturing techniques will be discussed.

**The Evaluators' Perspective: Ethics and Expectations**

*Presenter*: Meg V Blinkiewicz, Moore & Associates Inc  
*Abstract*: This presentation will focus on the ethical considerations – what are some of the factors to be considered if the role of an evaluator becomes blurred with the role of a management consultant. Can the evaluator exert undue influence with regards to data gathering and analysis beyond the immediate parameters of an initiative? When does an evaluator cross the line from being a formative evaluator to being part of the intervention? Should the contribution of the evaluation function be part of the assessment of the achievements of the initiative? Should the evaluation function be evaluated? If so, how? Are there checks and balances that can be put into place? Is there a new type of evaluation evolving, because of the increased availability of data? This presentation will discuss the importance of clear expectations and offer guidelines for evaluators who are thinking of entering this type of arrangement.

---

**Revitalizing Institutions Through Arts and Cultural Evaluation**

Panel Session 740 to be held in the Kennedy room  
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG  
*Chair*: Leslie S Whitaker, Philliber Research Associates  
*Discussant*: Ariel Tomioka, Independent Consultant  
*Session Abstract*: The proposed panel presentation seeks to engage evaluators, funders, and staff of arts and cultural organizations in a conversation about revitalizing institutions through arts and cultural evaluation. As arts funding shrinks and the demand for a multicultural society increases, arts and cultural institutions are encouraged to think about themselves and their audiences in new and creative ways. This entails a greater need for representation, accountability, and a redefinition of the role of arts in community change. Given this context, outcome evaluation is playing an increasingly vital role in the future of arts and cultural institutions. Ariel Tomioka, discussant, will facilitate the discussion. Leslie Whitaker will discuss her experiences evaluating symphony orchestras, focusing on institutional context and change. Lastly, Ashley Cruce will discuss the role of arts and cultural evaluation vis-a-vis debates on public life, cultural politics, and community through the lens of two contemporary art museums.

**Institutional Change in Context: Evaluation for Symphony Orchestras**

*Presenter*: Leslie S Whitaker, Philliber Research Associates  
*Abstract*: Symphony orchestras are often perceived as culturally elite organizations that do little to reach out beyond their regular patrons. In addition, most of these institutions still function as strict hierarchies that place conductors at the top and musicians at the bottom (with little or no attention to the needs of audience members). However, these institutions must seek broader support (including new audiences and funding bases) in order to survive. Their survival depends on institutional and systemic change, including building the commitment of management, Board members, musicians, funders, policy makers, and the community at large to the cause of symphonic music for broader audiences. Evaluation research is a key part of this change. This presentation discusses the use of evaluation research to inform institutional and systemic change, using examples from a nationwide consortium of 15
Evaluation in the Arts: System Barriers and System Possibilities
Presenter Patricia A Shifferd, American Composers Forum
Abstract Programs and activities of arts and cultural organizations are only beginning to receive the kind of systematic evaluation that has become standard practice in other sectors. Thus, the theory, methods, and practice of evaluation in the arts are underdeveloped. This paper will focus briefly on the methodological problems of measuring the impact of arts/cultural organization programming. However, the paper will mainly explore the systemic barriers that exist to developing an evaluation culture in the arts and culture sector, both within arts and cultural organizations and within funding organizations to which they turn for support. Recent promising trends in evaluation in the arts will also be explored.

Empowerment and Participatory Evaluation: Highlighting Tools from Databases to Listservs
Multipaper Session 741 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair Rita O'Sullivan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Weaving a Curriculum Update Exercise into the On-site Review Process at Waukesha County Technical College
Presenter Alexandra B Sielaff, Waukesha County Technical College
Abstract Program evaluations at Waukesha County Technical College are conducted every five to six years and encompass three stages: self-study, on-site review and follow-up measures. In the course of some self-study processes, it becomes evident that the target occupation for the degree program has significantly changed in its orientation and job requirements. It follows that the curriculum requires more than a minor revision and, concurrently, the need for an evaluation of other aspects of program delivery still remains. In these cases, we have developed an intensive on-site review model that involves the simultaneous expertise of both the evaluation coordinator and the instructional design specialist. This on-site process requires close coordination and timing to ensure that the desired outcomes result in both a revised curriculum template as well as a more global product of program observations and recommendations. The outcome is a more efficient and responsive method of evolving a program to meet the needs of students and employers. The step-by-step methodology for this process will be presented with visual support and electronic or paper outlines.

The User-oriented Approach for Welfare-to-work Programs
Presenter Danielle E Ruedt, Children and Youth Coordinating Council
Abstract This presentation will demonstrate how a User-Oriented Formative Evaluation has been successfully integrated into a welfare-to-work program. In this workshop, participants will learn how the User-Oriented Approach incorporates the evaluation audience into the process of data collection, analysis, and formulating recommendations. This method compares to other approaches by examining program activities as well as measuring adherence to contractual goals and objectives. The User-Oriented Approach can best be applied in Performance-Based Evaluations that facilitate ownership and empowerment of the users to carry out program recommendations. The strengths of the User-Oriented Approach are as follows: the incorporation of the evaluation audience throughout the evaluation process, immediate practical recommendations generated in conjunction with the evaluator and the evaluation audience, and assessment of adherence to contractual obligations. The difficulty of affecting change at higher management levels is the primary weakness of this approach.

Strengthening Programs and Institutions Through Self-assessment: IPPF/WHR's Participatory Methodology
Presenters Rebecca L Koladycz, International Planned Parenthood Federation
Victoria Ward, International Planned Parenthood Federation
Abstract International Planned Parenthood Federation/Western Hemisphere Region (IPPF/WHR) developed a series of self-assessment modules
for improving sexual and reproductive health programs and institutions. Using a methodology that produces action-oriented results with a minimal investment of time, the modules assess decision-making, organizational commitment, and institutional capacity in a variety of programmatic and management areas. A key strength of the methodology is that a diverse cross-section of stakeholders participate in the process. While the methodology does not evaluate the effectiveness of programs, follow-up assessments can be done to determine if appropriate programmatic improvements were made. The demonstration will introduce the modules by reviewing the topics covered, participants in the process, the instruments and their structures, analysis and interpretation procedures, time-frame, and costs. To familiarize participants with the methodology, one module will be reviewed in-depth, followed by a discussion of how the methodology can be adapted to other settings.

**Using Learning History Evaluation to Promote Project Growth and Staff Empowerment**

**Presenters**
- Cheryl Endres, Grand Rapids Community College
- Ann Marie Allen, Grand Rapids Community College

**Abstract**
The evaluation team at Grand Rapids Community College has worked the last 7 years to adapt the concept of learning history - originally developed at MIT's Center of Organizational Learning - for evaluation application in education and community, as well as corporate settings. Learning history techniques are combined with the best of traditional program evaluation methodology to provide a comprehensive learning process where project staff, stakeholders and the evaluators work together in a team effort, empowering the team to take action based on new learnings. The process includes a cycle of data collection, analysis and organization of data, presentation and discussion of data in regularly scheduled Interactive Learning Sessions; and the preparation and presentation of short learning history reports provided to project staff after each learning history session. The short interim reports then become the backbone of a full-scale summative learning history document at the end of the project.

---

**The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA): A Tool for Management, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation - Three Perspectives**

**MultiPaper Session 742 to be held in the Lincoln room**

**Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG**

**Chair**
- Arlene R Stanton, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment

**Discussant**
- Martha Ann Carey, National Institute of Mental Health

**Telling the Story: Performance Monitoring of Substance Abuse Treatment and The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993**

**Presenters**
- Kevin P Mulvey, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment
- Arlene R Stanton, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment

**Abstract**
The Government Performance Results Act of 1993 was enacted to improve stewardship in the federal government, linking resources and management decisions to program performance. Under GPRA, Federal departments and agencies must develop 3 to 5 year strategic plans; set performance targets and report progress, annually; and use evaluation results to explain failure or success. This presentation describes organizational, political, practical and logistical experiences encountered in implementing GPRA requirements within the Center for Substance Abuse, a Federal agency with over 100 programs in 3 major activity areas: Knowledge Development, Knowledge Application, and Targeted Capacity Expansion. GPRA measures are intended as easily understood, useful indicators based on routine data collection, and allow comparability of outcomes across client populations and program types. Their actual development and implementation has sparked some unanticipated consequences but also opportunities, including creation of a web-based "information management environment" with the potential to truly change how CSAT "does business."

**The Implementation of GPRA: A Programmatic Experience**

**Presenter**
- Donna D Atkinson, ACS/Birch & Davis

**Evaluating the Effectiveness of Adolescent Substance Abuse Treatment Based on CSAT's Core Outcome Measure Under GPRA**

**Presenters**
- Michael L Dennis, Chestnut Health Systems
- Randy Muck, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment

---

**International Public and Private Enterprise Evaluation**

**MultiPaper Session 743 to be held in the Roosevelt room**

**Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Lucia Fort, The World Bank

**An Impact Evaluation Framework and Strategy for the World Bank Institute's Programs**
Access to microcredit is widely considered to be one of the most effective ways to promote women's economic and social empowerment. This paper compares three different evaluation paradigms used to assess the gender impacts of microcredit programs in Bangladesh. The comparison is interesting both to describe a number of innovative evaluation methods, and to illustrate how the choice of evaluation paradigm affects the kinds of data which are collected and the lessons which are drawn concerning the gender impacts of the microcredit programs. One study uses econometric analysis to assess program impacts on women's economic status; the second examines the impacts of women's access to credit on their empowerment and political status within the household and community, and the third uses anthropological techniques to argue that loans obtained by women are frequently controlled by men so that the impact on women's empowerment is less than claimed by other studies. The papers argue the benefits of multimethod evaluation designs.

**The Impacts of Microcredit Programs on Women in Bangladesh: A Comparison of Three Evaluation Paradigms**

**Presenter**
Mark D Bardini, The World Bank

**Abstract**
Access to microcredit is widely considered to be one of the most effective ways to promote women's economic and social empowerment. This paper compares three different evaluation paradigms used to assess the gender impacts of microcredit programs in Bangladesh. The comparison is interesting both to describe a number of innovative evaluation methods, and to illustrate how the choice of evaluation paradigm affects the kinds of data which are collected and the lessons which are drawn concerning the gender impacts of the microcredit programs. One study uses econometric analysis to assess program impacts on women's economic status; the second examines the impacts of women's access to credit on their empowerment and political status within the household and community, and the third uses anthropological techniques to argue that loans obtained by women are frequently controlled by men so that the impact on women's empowerment is less than claimed by other studies. The papers argue the benefits of multimethod evaluation designs.

**Striving to See the Invisible: Evaluation of Programs for Regularizing the Informal Sector**

**Presenter**
Katherine McKnight, University of Arizona

**Abstract**
The Italian experience with regularization of the informal economy shows how evaluation plays a role in social and economic change. Not only does evaluation provide information policy makers and stakeholders can use in shaping and discussing programs. The introduction of evaluation itself alters the way the public sector relates to workers and enterprises, thus contributing to regularization. A difficult relationship between the public sector on the one hand and workers and enterprises on the other hand is among the causes of the informal economy. In addition, the very methods evaluators use change social perceptions and behaviors. The task of evaluating regularization programs entails peculiar difficulties. The evaluator is trying to analyze just what people are striving to hide. In testing appropriate sampling and interviewing techniques, evaluators are finding their role changed. The paper draws on a group of on-going evaluations of regularization programs in Italy.

**Evaluating School Reform Action Plans: An Example of the Need for Theory-driven Evaluation**

**Panel Session 744 to be held in the Arlington room**

**Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
Katherine McKnight, University of Arizona

**Session Abstract**
In 1999, Senate Bill 1X, the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) was enacted into law in the State of California. As part of this bill, the Immediate Intervention and Underperforming Schools Program was established. Schools identified as underperforming are invited to develop an Action Plan with an External Evaluator. Schools who choose to participate submit these plans to the California Department of Education for funding. The plans lay out a strategy for school reform with the goal of improving student performance on standardized tests. The purpose of this panel is to discuss the lessons learned from evaluating these Action Plans. Specifically, we will discuss the results of our evaluation within the framework of theory-driven evaluation, reflected in the writings of Rossi and colleagues and discussed in Shaddish, Cook & Leviton (1991).

**An Overview of the California State Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools (II/USP ) Legislation and the Evaluation of the School Reform Action Plans**

**Presenter**
Laura Tagle, Evaluation Unit Ministry of the Economy and Finance

**Abstract**
The Government of Ghana in 1989 instituted a performance monitoring and evaluation system (PMES) in the public enterprise sector as part of a national effort to improve the performance of that segment of the economy. Since its establishment, the PMES has focused on monitoring and provision of bottom-line judgement about each enterprise's performance at the end of the year with very little diagnosis of how well the PMES has been implemented in the enterprises. In addition, there has been no systematic evaluation to determine the impact of the PMES on the performance of the enterprises. The primary objective of this paper is to examine the context of evaluation and identify barriers, issues, and challenges that shape the design and implementation of evaluations and use of evaluation findings in Ghana. It also suggests ways to overcome these challenges.
**The Role of a Solid Needs Assessment in Theory-driven Evaluation**

Presenter: Gwendolyn Johnson, University of Arizona

Abstract: Part of the development of a successful school reform plan should be a solid understanding of the baseline conditions of the underperforming school. This solid understanding can be obtained through a thorough needs assessment. Evaluators were hired to conduct such an assessment for these underperforming schools, yet results of the evaluation of the Action Plans suggest that the assessment was insufficient to form a basis of understanding regarding the barriers to student achievement that the plans were designed to target and remove. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the role of needs assessments in theory-driven evaluation.

**The Problem with Focusing on Problems: A Problem-based Versus a Systemic Approach**

Presenter: Katherine McKnight, University of Arizona

Abstract: The purpose of the II/USP Action Plan is to provide a reform model for schools identified as underperforming to improve student achievement. Within the theory-driven approach to evaluation and program planning, these plans should therefore be based on a strategy guided by a model of school reform. Instead, plans were largely problem-focused; that is, they targeted multiple problems identified by the school and the external evaluator and identified solutions to these problems. This sort of focus reflects a 'patchwork quilt' approach and fails to provide a unifying strategy that takes the whole education system in which these schools are situated. We discuss the implications of this problem-based approach for the success of these school reform plans.

**Meeting Methodological Challenges in Assessing Health Care Outcomes**

MultiPaper Session 745 to be held in the Fairfax room

Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG

Chair: Diane Berthelette, Universite du Quebec a Montreal

**Improving Care At the End of Life: Using a Quasi-Experimental Design to Test the Effectiveness of a Quality Improvement Intervention**

Presenters: Arthur E Blank, Albert Einstein College of Medicine

Marilyn Bookbinder, Beth Israel Medical Center New York

Russell K Portenoy, Beth Israel Medical Center New York

Abstract: Efforts to enhance the efficacy and effectiveness of health care have crossed traditional professional boundaries, focused on broad system change, local institutional change, and on narrower individual change. The results of the hospital-based pilot study reported here used a quasi-experimental design to examine whether an end-of-life could be reduced by using Quality Improvement techniques to create and sustain individual and institutional change. Using internal contrasts among (1) a gold standard for providing care at the end of life, (2) an intervention unit, and (3) a control unit, pilot results suggest that over time the intervention unit improved their symptom and problem assessment to approach that of the gold standard while diverging from the control unit. The Plan, Do, Study, Act components of QI techniques also suggest some interesting ways for enhancing evaluations and evaluators ability to detect and monitor institutional and individual change.

**Alternate Approach to Evaluate Project Impact in Absence of Case-control Design**

Presenters: Manish Subharwal, CARE India

T Uska Kiran, CARE India

Abstract: The article suggests a technique to assess the impact of a large-scale development project in absence of strict case-control design. CARE in India implements a project named "Integrated Nutrition and Health Project" (INHP) in 100,000 village level units with 7 million direct beneficiaries. Due to the wide geographical spread and several other constraints, it was not possible to have a strict case-control design for assessment of impact. Data from two National Family Health Surveys conducted in 1992-93 and 1998-99 was used as a reference as it is internationally recognized to be representing characteristics of Indian population. Regression model is generated from these two NFHS data sets and baseline values of INHP are used to predict the regular improvements in the project specific nutrition and health indicators. These predicted values are then compared with the evaluation results of the project to assess whether project interventions have led to significant improvements.
**Assets: An Intervention Developed for Pregnant and Parenting Adolescents**

**Presenters**
- Saki Cabrera Strait, The Perinatal Council
- Karen F Troki, Alcohol Research Group
- Norman Turk, Alcohol Research Group
- Barbara Bunn McCullough, The Perinatal Council

**Abstract**
A total of 211 pregnant and parenting teenagers participated in ASSETS; evaluation data was collected 4 points in time; 122 were randomly assigned to the intervention group. When dosage was controlled, participants showed gains in academic performance, reduced subsequent pregnancies, parenting, recovery from stressors, and other life and well being factors. These quantitative findings are difficult to make coherent sense of since such a small group of individuals is involved. There is a lot of variability and very small cell sizes so one or two people can have a significant impact on the data. On the other hand, having the ability to evaluate the services according to dosage enabled program refinement and the identification of significant changes that can have a long-term impact on general health, the way the mothers react to their children in every day situations and lay a foundation for being more assertive about planning for the future.

**Evaluation: A Strategy to Support Decision Making - The Quebec Experience in Telehealth**

**Presenters**
- Jean Paul Fortin, Universite Laval
- Pierre Joubert, Fonds Quebecois de la Recherche sur la Societe et la Culture
- Lise Lamothe, Universite de Montreal
- Alain Cloutier, Universite de Quebec
- Daniel Reinharz, Universite Laval
- Marie-Pierre Gagnon, Universite Laval
- Guy Lavoie, Universite Laval
- Francoise Labbe, Universite Laval
- Julie Duplantie, Universite Laval

**Abstract**
In the last ten years, telehealth has shown its importance in Quebec health system. It did so with projects such as the Eastern Quebec Telehealth Network, the Quebec’s Patient Smart Card Project, the Quebec Child Telehealth Network, the Oncology Network Computerized Patient Record. These projects and others have highlighted the potential of telehealth for different clinical activities, for health care services and organisation and, most of all, for the patients. A meta-analysis has been done to highlight how the evaluation strategies and methods used have influenced decision making processes at local, regional and central levels during and after the projects. This study shows how integrated, comprehensive and pluralist evaluation can affect the development and diffusion of innovating project as well as the health care system as a whole.

**Results from New Approaches in Environmental Management**

**MultiPaper Session 746 to be held in the Prince William room**
**Sponsored by the Environmental Program Evaluation TIG**
**Chair**
- Jean Haley, Haley-McGuiness Consulting Group

**Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Evaluation of Flexible Air Permitting Techniques**

**Presenter**
- David Dellarco, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Abstract**
In the last ten years, telehealth has shown its importance in Quebec health system. It did so with projects such as the Eastern Quebec Telehealth Network, the Quebec’s Patient Smart Card Project, the Quebec Child Telehealth Network, the Oncology Network Computerized Patient Record. These projects and others have highlighted the potential of telehealth for different clinical activities, for health care services and organisation and, most of all, for the patients. A meta-analysis has been done to highlight how the evaluation strategies and methods used have influenced decision making processes at local, regional and central levels during and after the projects. This study shows how integrated, comprehensive and pluralist evaluation can affect the development and diffusion of innovating project as well as the health care system as a whole.

**An Evaluation of Statewide Watershed Management Approaches**

**Presenter**
- Michael R Mason, US Environmental Protection Agency

**Abstract**
Over the past decade, approximately 20 state environmental agencies have adopted a statewide watershed approach in the management of their water programs. A statewide watershed approach consists of: (1) the delineation of a state into watershed or basin management areas; (2) a series of management steps to guide the integration and implementation of regulatory and non-regulatory actions (i.e., monitoring, assessment, planning, implementation); and (3) a process for involving stakeholders. In 2001, EPA’s Office of Water conducted an evaluation of eight states’ experiences in
implementing different models of statewide watershed management. The evaluation found that although the statewide watershed approach has resulted in numerous program management benefits to state water programs, states face significant internal and external barriers to effectively implementing the approach. Key barriers include tensions between programmatic requirements and team-based watershed management, fragmented and output-oriented oversight by federal agencies, and incomplete integration of core water quality program elements around the watershed approach. The evaluation includes practical recommendations for U.S. EPA and states for providing greater support for the approach.

Cost Benefit Analysis of Domestic Appliances Derived Waste Collection Schemes

Presenters
Henri Masson, Intelligence & Strategy for the Environment
Caroline Roufosse, Intelligence & Strategy for the Environment

Abstract
This paper focuses on 4 scenarios for collecting spent domestic appliances (brown, white, and grey) derived waste: 1) voluntary deposit at a container park, intervention of a local sorting centre, refurbishing by social economy organisations, recycling and landfilling of the remaining parts; 2) voluntary deposit at a container park, regional regrouping, sorting out metals and dumping the remaining part, by a private operator; 3) door-by-door collection, at fixed date, regional regrouping, sorting out metals and dumping the remaining parts, by a private operator; 4) door-by-door collection and refurbishing by dedicated social economy organisations, recycling and landfilling of the remaining parts. A quick environmental impact assessment along this ‘reverse logistic chain’ has shown that the mean impact is transport. Taking a local case (the German-speaking Community of Belgium), the 4 scenarios have been analysed in detail, in order to quantify the allocable kilometres spent for a given object (a 50 kg ‘white good’ like a washing machine as an example). The diagnosis consists then in putting in balance the environmental impact of transport and the gain in landfilled weight, as resulting from resale and recycling. This exercise has been done, using well-accepted cost-benefit methods and cost figures for both situations (transport and landfill). The methodology is generic and easily transposable, the only local inputs being the distances between the different players involved in the process, the level of recycling technically and commercially achievable, the density of the local population and its socio-economic characteristics (level of equipment, average lifetime).
**Conference Sessions: Saturday, November 9, 2002 - 11:25 am to 12:55 pm**

### Conference Committee Strand

#### The AEA Affiliates and Their Roles in Building Evaluation Capacity

**Think Tank Session 730 to be held in Ballroom C**
**Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee**

**Facilitator**  
Judith M Ottoson, Georgia State University

**Presenters**  
Thomas J Chapel, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Scott Keir, Oregon Program Evaluators Network  
Saumitra Sengupta, City & County of San Francisco  
Yvonne Bigos, Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability  
Paul Johnson, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development  
Richard King, Western Pennsylvania Evaluators Network  
Allison Titcomb, LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc  
Christina Olenik Lynch, Baltimore Area Evaluators  
Laura Blankertz, Matrix Research Institute  
Jeffrey Padden, Public Policy Associates Inc  
Laurie Hestness, Minnesota American Evaluation Association  
Andrea Anderson, Aspen Institute  
Cheryl MacNeil, Cheryl MacNeil Consulting  
Roland Winburn, Montgomery County Office of Family & Children First

**Session Abstract**  
The affiliates continue to explore their roles in context, in relation to each other, and in relation to the AEA. This year the affiliates build on their 2001 survey to strategize avenues for better supporting mutual areas of need, such as (1) starting affiliates (developing a "starter kit"); (2) sustaining affiliates; (3) website and list-serve development; (4) educational programs (speakers' circuit, tie in the Evaluator's Institute, etc); and (5) mentoring new evaluators. The intent of the session is to find ways to support mutual needs of the affiliates, while also supporting ways in which the affiliates independently and diversely respond to their own contexts. A funding proposal to support evaluation capacity building among the affiliates is an intended by-product of this session.

### TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions

#### Evaluating the Evaluator: Tools for Assessing Our Performance as Evaluation Professionals

**Think Tank Session 748 to be held in Ballroom A**
**Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG**

**Chair**  
Jean Haley, Haley-McGuiness Consulting Group

**Presenters**  
Kathleen A Dowell, Partners in Evaluation & Planning LLC  
Jo Ann Doino-Ingersoll, Strategic Research  
Julie W Chambless, Chambless & Associates Inc

**Abstract**  
To enhance their practice of evaluation, evaluators must be able to identify ways in which they do and do not meet the needs of end-users. One way to gather this information is to have clients, as well as evaluation professionals, "evaluate the evaluator." Evaluators can use the results of such assessments to enhance the way they conduct evaluation activities, which, in turn, may benefit end-user organizations by increasing their understanding and acceptance of evaluation as an integrated and on-going component of their programs and services. This session will present multi-method instruments designed to gather feedback from evaluation clients and evaluation professionals on how well evaluators have performed their professional duties, as specified in the Evaluation Standards. Participant groups will review the instruments and explore modifications/ways of evaluating evaluators more effectively. The groups will reconvene to discuss proposed modifications and future uses of the instruments.

#### Designs for Rigorous Evaluation of Learning Technology

---

**Evaluation 2002: Saturday, November 9, 11:25 am to 12:55 am**
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Clustered in classrooms whose technology use practices are studied intensively and in some cases manipulated through carefully designed experiments.

Engagement, self-concept as a learner, technology skills, career/college plans, achievement test performance, and scores on performance tests that target secondary school, this evaluation would collect data on the nature and quantity of students' technology use and outcomes, such as school attendance and longitudinal evaluation of students' use of technology in and out of school. Following a nationally representative cohort of students from middle through both descriptive and explanatory in nature, the evaluation provides for focused studies of the impact of technology in specific classrooms within a broader pedagogy are systematically varied. The model uses extended projects as an outcome, which permits, but does not require computer use. Teachers and comparisons with students without computer experiences hardly relevant. This paper proposes a matched design in which technology use and teacher innovative technology-based projects often employ assessment that require technology competencies (spreadsheet proficiency), thereby rendering makes little difference. Such tests deny computer-capable students the opportunity to demonstrate competencies they may have acquired. On the other hand, tests, which are typically used to compare students with and without computer experience, are largely composed of items for which computer experience makes little difference. This paper presents a perspective on evaluation of educational technology that emphasizes the importance of locally valid and locally useful research designs. The authors argue that effective evaluation must produce both research-based knowledge of what technological applications can work best in educational environments, and practice-based knowledge of how the technology integration process can best be designed to meet locally defined learning goals in schools. In this regard, the authors outline how a network of intermediary organizations can work to review, synthesize and generalize from locally generated evaluation studies, producing broad-based findings that can guide large-scale policymaking. The authors argue that evaluation research that is responsive to local concerns, constraints and priorities, can be structured and synthesized to produce knowledge about effective uses of educational technology that has both a high level of face validity within local communities and informs the much larger-scale projects of policymakers.

**A Project-based Assessment Model for Judging the Effects of Technology Use in Comparison Group Studies**

Policymakers ask whether and under what conditions computers make a difference in student achievement. However, standardized tests, which are typically used to compare students with and without computer experience, are largely composed of items for which computer experience makes little difference. Such tests deny computer-capable students the opportunity to demonstrate competencies they may have acquired. On the other hand, innovative technology-based projects often employ assessments that require technology competencies (spreadsheet proficiency), thereby rendering comparisons with students without computer experiences hardly relevant. This paper proposes a matched design in which technology use and teacher pedagogy are systematically varied. The model uses extended projects as an outcome, which permits, but does not require computer use. Teachers and evaluators negotiate the boundaries of the extended projects, in terms of content, component tasks, products, and ground-rules. These assessment support teacher's objectives and meet standards of comparability, validity, and reliability.

**Investigating the Cumulative Impacts of Educational Technology**

In this paper, the authors outline a design for an ambitious, national longitudinal evaluation of the impact of learning technology use. Both descriptive and explanatory in nature, the evaluation provides for focused studies of the impact of technology in specific classrooms within a broader longitudinal evaluation of students' use of technology in and out of school. Following a nationally representative cohort of students from middle through secondary school, this evaluation would collect data on the nature and quantity of students' technology use and outcomes, such as school attendance and engagement, self-concept as a learner, technology skills, career/college plans, achievement test performance, and scores on performance tests that target advanced information synthesis and communication skills. The evaluation would include both a large, national probability sample and samples of students clustered in classrooms whose technology use practices are studied intensively and in some cases manipulated through carefully designed experiments.

**Leveraging Points for Improving Educational Assessments**

Some points for improving educational assessments include:

- **Effective evaluation must produce both research-based knowledge of what technological applications can work best in educational environments, and practice-based knowledge of how the technology integration process can best be designed to meet locally defined learning goals in schools.**

- **Policymakers ask whether and under what conditions computers make a difference in student achievement.**

- **Assessments that require technology competencies (spreadsheet proficiency) are necessary.**

- **Comparisons with students without computer experiences are hardly relevant.**

- **A matched design in which technology use and teacher pedagogy are systematically varied.**

- **Extended projects as an outcome permit, but do not require computer use.**

- **Teachers and evaluators negotiate the boundaries of the extended projects, in terms of content, component tasks, products, and ground-rules.**

- **Assessments support teacher's objectives and meet standards of comparability, validity, and reliability.**

**Panel Session 749 to be held in Ballroom B**

**Sponsored by the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies TIG**

**Chair** Barbara Means, SRI International

**Discussant** Nick L Smith, Syracuse University

**Session Abstract** This panel will be comprised of four papers that present alternative research designs, methodologies, and assessment approaches to meet the need for systematic, rigorous evaluation of technology-supported innovations. The panel will begin with a brief overview of current practice in evaluating educational technologies. Each subsequent presentation will describe a design, methodology, or assessment approach. Contextualized evaluations, controlled experiments with random assignment, and hierarchical and longitudinal research designs, as well as assessment issues, will be described and discussed. Following brief presentations of key ideas in the papers, a discussant, Professor Nick Smith from Syracuse University, will serve as interlocutor, asking questions that (1) highlight points of agreement and disagreement across the panelists and (2) derive implications for a national research agenda. The final portion of the panel will be questions from the audience, again featuring the paper authors as panelists bringing their contrasting perspectives to bear in responding to the questions.

**Local Relevance and Generalizability: Linking Evaluation of Learning Technology to School Improvement**

**Presenters**
- Margaret Honey, Education Development Center
- Katherine McMillan Culp, Education Development Center
- Robert Spielvogel, Education Development Center

**Abstract** This paper presents a perspective on evaluation of educational technology that emphasizes the importance of locally valid and locally useful research designs. The authors argue that effective evaluation must produce both research-based knowledge of what technological applications can work best in educational environments, and practice-based knowledge of how the technology integration process can best be designed to meet locally defined learning goals in schools. In this regard, the authors outline how a network of intermediary organizations can work to review, synthesize and generalize from locally generated evaluation studies, producing broad-based findings that can guide large-scale policymaking. The authors argue that evaluation research that is responsive to local concerns, constraints and priorities, can be structured and synthesized to produce knowledge about effective uses of educational technology that has both a high level of face validity within local communities and informs the much larger-scale projects of policymakers.

**A Project-based Assessment Model for Judging the Effects of Technology Use in Comparison Group Studies**

**Presenters**
- Henry J Becker, University of California at Irvine
- Barbara E Lovitts, American Institutes for Research

**Abstract** Policymakers ask whether and under what conditions computers make a difference in student achievement. However, standardized tests, which are typically used to compare students with and without computer experience, are largely composed of items for which computer experience makes little difference. Such tests deny computer-capable students the opportunity to demonstrate competencies they may have acquired. On the other hand, innovative technology-based projects often employ assessments that require technology competencies (spreadsheet proficiency), thereby rendering comparisons with students without computer experiences hardly relevant. This paper proposes a matched design in which technology use and teacher pedagogy are systematically varied. The model uses extended projects as an outcome, which permits, but does not require computer use. Teachers and evaluators negotiate the boundaries of the extended projects, in terms of content, component tasks, products, and ground-rules. These assessments support teacher's objectives and meet standards of comparability, validity, and reliability.

**Investigating the Cumulative Impacts of Educational Technology**

**Presenters**
- Mary Wagner, SRI International
- Barbara Means, SRI International
- Geneva D Haertel, SRI International
- Harold J avitz, SRI International

**Abstract** In this paper, the authors outline a design for an ambitious, national longitudinal evaluation of the impact of learning technology use. Both descriptive and explanatory in nature, the evaluation provides for focused studies of the impact of technology in specific classrooms within a broader longitudinal evaluation of students' use of technology in and out of school. Following a nationally representative cohort of students from middle through secondary school, this evaluation would collect data on the nature and quantity of students' technology use and outcomes, such as school attendance and engagement, self-concept as a learner, technology skills, career/college plans, achievement test performance, and scores on performance tests that target advanced information synthesis and communication skills. The evaluation would include both a large, national probability sample and samples of students clustered in classrooms whose technology use practices are studied intensively and in some cases manipulated through carefully designed experiments.

**Leveraging Points for Improving Educational Assessments**

**Presenters**
- Robert J Mislevy, University of Maryland
Abstract
Advances in cognitive psychology deepen our understanding of how students gain and use knowledge. Advances in technology make it possible to capture more complex performances in assessment settings by including simulation, interactivity, collaboration, and constructed responses. However, developing assessments to capture more complex performances requires not only innovative technologies, but also schemas for producing principled, coherent assessments. Principled assessments link student models of performance to the evidence that must be gathered and to the features of the assessment tasks that elicit such evidence. Such assessments can be used to ground inferences about student learning or to evaluate complex programs. These assessments build on a sound chain of reasoning from what is observed to what is inferred. This presentation reviews an evidence-centered framework for designing and analyzing assessments, then uses this framework to discuss how advances in technology, education, and psychology can be harnessed to improve assessment.

Comprehensive Program Evaluation: Assessing the Impact
MultiPaper Session 751 to be held in Ballroom D
Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG
Chair Anna Taylor, University of Alberta

A Holistic Model for Comprehensive Program Evaluation
Presenters Kim K Metcalf, Indiana University
Patricia A Muller, Indiana University

Abstract
The Holistic Model for comprehensive program evaluation was developed through the ongoing work of an evaluation center to provide a more comprehensive and useful approach to evaluation. The model builds upon the growing trend away from “black box” evaluations, and integrates elements of many of the earlier evaluation models, in a manner that expands upon the types of information that any one of these models can provide to program stakeholders. In order to accomplish the dual purposes of program valuation and program improvement, the Holistic Model simultaneously gathers information on each of four interrelated program elements: (1) the Intended Program; (2) the Program Context; (3) the Actualized Program; and (4) Program Outcomes. Applying the Holistic Model, data are collected through a range of techniques on each of these four elements throughout the project, with a focus on understanding how and why the program works as it does.

Advancing Program Theory with Public Health Thinking
Presenters L Michele Issel, University of Illinois at Chicago
Nicole Miller, University of Illinois at Chicago

Abstract
The purpose of this presentation is to advance the development of program theory through an interdisciplinary approach connecting key public health assessment concepts with health program development and evaluation. The premise is that data from a community health assessment ought to provide contextual information about health problems. Antecedents to a health problem, determinants of a health problem and contributing factors to a health problem can be integrated into the development of a program theory. Explicating the variables related to these facilitates the subsequent development of the program effect theory and its sub-theories, as originally suggested by Rossi and Freeman. The fresh, interdisciplinary approach offered helps systematically reform the current evaluation field and enhances the area of theory-driven programs.

Measuring Social Capital at the Community Level: The Retrospective Evaluation of the Santa Ana College Community Outreach Partnership Center Initiative
Presenters Eraldo R González, University of California at Irvine
Thomas Wicke, University of California at Irvine
Jennifer Gress, University of California at Irvine

Abstract In 2000, Santa Ana College completed its Housing and Urban DevelopmentÆs Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) initiative funding period. The initiative was designed for institutions of higher education to partner with community level institutions, organizations, and residents to assist in their efforts to respond to locally-defined challenges of greatest concern. The COPC Core Planning Group provided an opportunity for a team of graduate students enrolled in the University of California IrvineÆs Social Capital and Community Building class to develop and implement an evaluation of what the partners had accomplished. In consultation with the Core Planning Group, the team developed a framework based on three features of social capital: trust, reciprocity, and networks. The presentation will provide our approach and methodology to evaluate social capital, and the main
evaluation results for one community project and among all initiative partners.

**Using the Outcome-Based Evaluation Model to Evaluate the Impact of Projects, Programs or Policies**

**Presenter**
Mukaria J. Itang’ata, Western Michigan University

**Abstract**
Outcome-Based Evaluation provides a systematic way to evaluate the extent to which a project, program or policy has achieved its intended results (Riesman and Clegg, 2000). The model can be a useful tool for improving the quality of programs, policies, or projects; ensuring resources are well allocated, accounted for and monitored. Additionally, this model can be a powerful tool for (1) identifying intended programs’, projects’, or policies’ outcomes and levels (2) conceptualizing programs, projects or policies evaluation theories, logic models, evaluation standards (3) enabling the use of programs’, projects’ or policies’ indicators to make the outcomes measurable (4) selecting evaluation designs and for evaluating reliability and validity. This abstract’s author has used the model to evaluate the impact of problem-based learning and traditional curricula models on learning perception and satisfaction among physician assistant students. Overall the Outcome-Based Evaluation Model was practical, and yields good evaluation results. It can be a useful tool for undertaking evaluations.

**What Makes a Great Graduate Program in Evaluation? Content, Design, and Systemic Issues**

**Think Tank Session 752 to be held in Ballroom E**

**Sponsored by the Graduate Student TIG and the Teaching of Evaluation TIG**

**Chairs**
Deborah Wasserman, The Ohio State University
E Jane Davidson, Western Michigan University

**Presenters**
Rosalind E Hurworth, The University of Melbourne
Masafumi Nagao, Hiroshima University
Daniel L Stufflebeam, Western Michigan University
Jean A King, University of Minnesota

**Session Abstract**
This Think Tank will discuss and build on the results of a needs assessment conducted with input from current, prospective, and recent evaluation students, organizations that hire evaluators, experienced evaluation practitioners, and faculty who teach evaluation. After seeing the results, five well-respected evaluation educators from diverse settings will contribute their thoughts on the topic. The second half of the session will move to a roundtable discussion format whose purpose is to (a) stimulate outside-the-box thinking about what makes a great program, (b) reflect on the systemic and mindset changes needed to make such a program possible, and (c) create a checklist to guide the creation and improvement of, and informed student choices, about graduate programs in evaluation. Particular attention will be paid to identifying the systemic barriers (within universities, within the evaluation profession, and/or within national education systems) that might prevent the creation of exemplary graduate programs in evaluation.

**Helping Local Practitioners to Evaluate Their Community-based Programs**

**Demonstration Session 753 to be held in Ballroom F**

**Sponsored by the Extension Education Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
Susan J Barkman, Purdue University

**Presenters**
Susan J Barkman, Purdue University
Krisanna Machtmes, Louisiana State University

**Session Abstract**
It has become essential that community-based organizations are able to measure the impact of their programs. The problem is that staff in many of these organizations have limited or no formal education in program evaluation. With this in mind, presenters of this skill-building workshop have developed a "Field Guide for Designing Quantitative Instruments." The guide focuses on outcome-based evaluation and ties into the Logic Model process utilized by many community-based organizations. The guide describes easy-to-follow steps for developing tests, surveys/ questionnaires, and observation checklists. It includes tips on such things as writing effective questions, choosing the appropriate response choices and/or scaling, and selecting methodology for administering the instrument. Also included are quick "field" methods to help improve instruments and increase the reliability and validity of the data gather. The field guide is an excellent tool for AEA professionals to use as they work with these local practitioners.

**Locating Evaluation Use Within a Knowledge Utilization Framework**

**MultiPaper Session 754 to be held in the Washington A room**

**Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG**
Measuring Student Academic Achievement

**Abstract**

MultiPaper Session 755 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Tania A Rempert, Independent Consultant

**An Exploratory Approach to the Evaluation of an Educational Program: Developing and Applying New Methods for Outcome Analysis**

**Presenters**

| John C Hanes, Independent Consultant |
| Patrick Harman, Hayden-Harman Foundation |

**Abstract**

As part of a multi-faceted evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Urban Systemic Initiatives program, we developed and applied several new methods of an exploratory nature. These methods helped explicate and assess achievement gains in mathematics and science within 17 large urban school districts, as well as compare achievement gap reduction among various groups. The methods include: a color graphic approach; the application of absolute and relative adequacy ratios; and, event rate migration analysis using an underlying L'Abbe plot and tables for both resultants and angles.

**Correlates of Early School Achievement: Studies of Asian, Hispanic Black, Hispanic White, and Non-Hispanic White Populations in the United States**

**Presenters**

| Madhabi Chatterji, Columbia University |

**Abstract**

As part of a multi-faceted evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Urban Systemic Initiatives program, we developed and applied several new methods of an exploratory nature. These methods helped explicate and assess achievement gains in mathematics and science within 17 large urban school districts, as well as compare achievement gap reduction among various groups. The methods include: a color graphic approach; the application of absolute and relative adequacy ratios; and, event rate migration analysis using an underlying L'Abbe plot and tables for both resultants and angles.

**Using Evaluation to Analyze the Process of Aligning Tests to Standards**

**Presenters**

| Cheryl J Schwab, University of California at Berkeley |
| Carolyn Huie Hofsteter, University of California at Berkeley |

**Abstract**

This paper reports the findings of an innovative approach to evaluation that moves the evaluation results into the larger field of assessment. The context is a three-year evaluation of American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Project 2061 being conducted by the Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research (BEAR) Center. The staff of Project 2061 have constructed a procedure to assess the alignment of test items to national and state standards. At the same time several other projects have developed and implemented procedures for alignment, each of which are unique. As part of the evaluation a meeting was organized to bring the creators of the different alignment procedures together to analyze a set of common items and share the results. From discussions and reflections regarding the meeting the varying dimensions and issues of alignment are elucidated. This evaluation information can be used for further development in alignment within or outside Project 2061.

**Developing a Cross-state Comparable Method of Measuring Student Achievement in Charter Schools**

**Presenters**

| Christopher D Nelson, Western Michigan University |
| Brooks Applegate, Western Michigan University |

**Models for Decision Making in Human Services Systems**
MultiPaper Session 756 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG and the State and Local Government TIG
Chair Marian R Heinrichs, Olmsted County

The Performance Blueprint: An Integrated Logic Model Developed to Amplify Performance Measurement Literacy and Enhance Strategic Collaboration in Ohio's Appalachian Partnership for Welfare Reform
Presenter Paul J Longo, Ohio University
Abstract: Since 1998 the Appalachian Partnership for Welfare Reform (APWR) has provided applied research and technical assistance to the County Departments of Job and Family Services in Ohio's 29 Appalachian counties. A central part of APWR's mission is to develop operational capacity in the area of comprehensive performance measurement. The paper's specific purpose is to examine the evolution and application of APWR's "Performance Blueprint," a standard logic model enhanced by the schematics and techniques developed by Mark Friedman (Fiscal Policy Studies Institute). The paper's general purpose is to explore the strategic value of using a customized, multipurpose logic model as an effective mechanism for envisioning and realizing systemic reform. The presenter will define performance-measurement literacy and describe county-level and statewide applications of the Performance Blueprint in the areas of performance-measurement capacity development, performance-based contract management, and outcomes-based strategic planning and evaluation.

Performance and Outcome Measurement System (POMS) in Virginia: A Systematic Process That Can Reform Systems
Presenters Minakshi Tikoo, Virginia Department Of Mental Health Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services Gail Merridew, Virginia Department Of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services
Abstract: Virginia's Performance and Outcome Measurement System (POMS) has the potential to reform systems if it can survive Virginia General Assembly funding appropriations cuts. Even if POMS survives budget cuts, the utility of the system depends not only on the quality and quantity of data provided, but on the acceptance of the system by the individuals involved in the process. The factors that can improve the opportunity for POMS to bring about change are: 1) recognition of the system's value by management and staff at the community service boards, 2) willingness to support system stability for a defined period of time by the Department and General Assembly, and 3) commitment to timely system training and data evaluation. Evaluative systems have their best chance for survival when thoughtfully defined processes are allowed to flow through their natural life-cycle and improve the existing system.

Use of Structured Decision Making Assessment Tools in Child Protection Service (CPS) Program Evaluation
Presenter Marian R Heinrichs, Olmsted County
Abstract: Comparisons among cases in a treatment group can yield important insights for formative evaluation and stands as an alternative to more traditional treatment-control group comparisons. Attempts to apply this approach to evaluations of school reforms, however, have been hampered by the absence of cross-state comparable measures of student achievement. The problem is particularly acute for charter schools, which administer a wide variety of commercial and state-mandated examinations. This paper outlines a method for developing a cross-state comparable metric of student achievement in charter schools based on state-mandated criterion-referenced examinations. Where previous attempts to link state assessments have relied upon statistical moderation, our approach flows from the meta-analysis perspective. After describing the approach in general terms, the paper illustrates it using charter school achievement data from a number of states and discusses how the data will be used in a larger project on the correlates of success in U.S. charter schools.

Reflections on Evaluating Foundations' Multi-Site Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Demonstrating Systems and Policy Change-Challenges for the Evaluation
Panel Session 757 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG
Chair Lori Ailio, The California Endowment
Session Abstract: Multi-site comprehensive community initiatives sponsored by foundations offer distinctive challenges for evaluation. These initiatives often expect changes at the community, neighborhood levels and in broader cross-sector systems and policy areas. Evaluation of these complex community initiatives require approaches that document the processes by which changes at multiple levels occur and examine systems and policy reforms using compelling indicators. This presentation will discuss evaluation challenges in examining systems changes in three comprehensive initiatives. The California Works for Better Health supports community-based efforts that expand economic opportunities aimed at improving the health of people living in impoverished California communities. The Community Care Network partners local health delivery systems with community groups to improve health conditions in 25 communities across the U.S. The Partnership for the Public's Health aims to change community and institutional practices in order to more effectively address...
and prevent public health problems and promote community health in California.

**Knowledge Building and Evaluation in a Multi-site Comprehensive Community Initiative**

**Presenter**
Lori Allio, The California Endowment

**Abstract**
The evolution of comprehensive community initiatives has been from open programs with a plethora of potential community outcomes to highly participatory programs with a broad but delimited range of outcomes. California Works for Better Health "CWBH" includes outcomes in the area of capacity building, of work, and of health. Designed to be neighborhood based, collaborative, and focused on access systems resources, this complex initiative presents many challenges and learning opportunities for communities and foundations alike. This paper will share some of the innovative tools being utilized for CWBH's evaluation such as the "Theory of Change" approach, and the creation of neighborhood indicator systems.

**Connecting the Dots: Tracing Impact of Community Based Initiatives on Health Care Delivery Systems - Challenges for the Evaluator**

**Presenter**
Ann Zukoski, Independent Consultant

**Abstract**
The Community Care Network (CCN) was launched in 25 sites across the country challenging local health delivery systems to partner with community groups to improve health conditions in their communities. Now in its sixth year, the CCN demonstration has a special interest in how cross-sectoral partnerships transform or lead to changes in local health care delivery systems. This presentation will outline challenges posed in capturing systems and policy changes in a multi-site demonstration program including definitional, methodological, organizational and practical issues in demonstrating progress. By engaging members of the audience currently working on this evaluative approach, the presenter hopes a lively discussion can occur that looks at cross disciplinary approaches, alternative bodies of literature and theory that support this work as well as different measures, and methods of data collection. Most importantly the discussion will address how findings can be of value and are used by community partnerships.

**Evaluating Policy and Systems Change: Challenges and Lessons in Using a Community Based Participatory Evaluation Approach**

**Presenter**
Mia Luluquisen, Public Health Institute

**Abstract**
The mission of the Partnership for the Public's Health is to develop effective, responsive and sustainable public health systems. Effective public health systems build upon a broad definition of health and shared accountability among residents, community organizations and health departments for achieving community health improvement. Given the ambitious mission of this initiative that funds 39 partnerships in 14 public health jurisdictions throughout California, there are numerous challenges related to evaluating the complex, multi-site design within a framework of community based participatory evaluation. This presentation aims to engage the audience to discuss the challenges and issues related to conducting participatory evaluation, in which stakeholders actively participate and are involved in the development of the evaluation and all phases of implementation. Moreover, the discussion will address how participatory evaluation can capture and examine policy and systems change efforts in comprehensive initiatives.

**Sentencing and Corrections Evaluations**

**MultiPaper Session 758 to be held in the Potomac III room**

**Sponsored by**
The Crime and Justice TIG

**Chair**
William D Crano, Claremont Graduate University

**An Interrupted Time-series Analysis of the Impact of California's Three-strikes Law**

**Presenters**
William D Crano, Claremont Graduate University
Juan R Ramirez, Claremont Graduate University

**Abstract**
California's three strikes law has been in effect since 1994. Using an interrupted time series with nonequivalent variables design, we analyzed the impact of the law over on instrumental, violent, drug-related, and petty crimes (a control comparison). Analysis revealed an interesting and comprehensible pattern of results. The law appeared to deter instrumental (or non-impulsive) crimes substantially. It also had a significant incapacitating impact, reinforcing the observation that a very small proportion of offenders commit a high proportion of crimes. The law did not deter violent crimes; however, it had a powerful incapacitating effect, as evidenced by a significantly attenuated crime rate over the 5 years of our study. Three strikes had no effect whatsoever on drug-related offences. The policy-relevant implications of this analysis are important, and should be considered in discussions of the future of the three strikes law in California, and throughout the nation.

**A Comparison of Intensive Residential Treatment Programs for Criminal Justice Clients**

**Presenters**
Maureen L O'Keefe, Colorado Department of Corrections
Kelli J Klebe, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

**Abstract**
Virginia's Performance and Outcome Measurement System (POMS) has the potential to reform systems if it can survive Virginia General
Assembly funding appropriations cuts. Even if POMS survives budget cuts, the utility of the system depends not only on the quality and quantity of data provided, but on the acceptance of the system by the individuals involved in the process. The factors that can improve the opportunity for POMS to bring about change are: 1) recognition of the system’s value by management and staff at the community service boards, 2) willingness to support system stability for a defined period of time by the Department and General Assembly, and 3) commitment to timely system training and data evaluation. Evaluative systems have their best chance for survival when thoughtfully defined processes are allowed to flow through their natural life-cycle and improve the existing system.

Reconsidering Criminal Sentencing Practice in the District of Columbia
Presenter Kim S Hunt, Advisory Commission on Sentencing
Abstract The District of Columbia’s criminal justice system has been restructured over the last five years in response to Congressional action. Accompanying these policy moves was the creation of the Advisory Commission on Sentencing representing the local judiciary, legislative and executive branches, federal actors, and a research staff. Research staff provide evaluation of local past practices and current national trends in criminal sentencing. Empirical analysis of sentencing practice is coupled with the limited information available on comparative urban sentencing practice to yield recommendations for future policies. Despite a promising beginning, a number of barriers remain to making policy that is informed by research inquiry.

Evaluation within a Cultural Context
Panel Session 759 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG
Chairs Rita Kirshstein, American Institutes for Research
Elmina C J Johnson, National Science Foundation
Session Abstract The concept of “cultural context” of evaluation relates directly to the conference theme since it focuses on the elements of culture that affect all aspects of the evaluation process - from design and implementation through analysis and dissemination of results. This 90-minute panel will explore the evaluation issues associated with cultural factors from the perspectives of three minority evaluation professionals. These persons will discuss the impact of cultural context (African American, Hispanic, and Native American) on evaluation outcomes based on their understanding of cultural factors and on their experiences as practicing evaluators of national projects and programs. Additionally, an overview presentation will address NSF’s efforts to develop a framework for evaluator training which responds to these issues. An NSF discussant will offer comments on the similarities and differences among the three cultural perspectives and the implications for future NSF actions. A minimum of 15-20 minutes will be provided for audience feedback.

Overview of Conceptual Framework
Presenter Rita Kirshstein, American Institutes for Research
Abstract Our intent in developing the conceptual framework for conducting culturally-sensitive evaluations was to focus on the issues surrounding the influence of culture on evaluation design and outcomes and the interaction of cultural and other contextual factors, i.e., economics, geography, and so forth. The framework provides guidance for developing instruments and conducting data collection procedures, and was designed for enhancing the skills of evaluators at different levels of expertise and experience in evaluation approaches. It also takes into account the need for experience in culturally sensitive program design and evaluation, and the most appropriate methods for teaching these skills to researchers. We have searched the literature for teaching models that are designed to use with minority populations; these explicate the facets of the teaching model that are designed particularly for use with minority students and thus the facets that are expected to provide better outcomes for the minority group in question.

A Consideration of Culturally Responsive Strategies in Program Evaluation: The Thoughts of One African American Evaluator
Presenter Stafford Hood, Arizona State University
Abstract There is an increasing conversation within the evaluation community that cultural responsiveness should be an integral part of the evaluation process. To some of us it is only reasonable that an evaluator should take into account cultural context when designing and conducting an evaluation. However, the view that implementing culturally responsive evaluation is a good idea is not universally shared. One of the obvious challenges is identifying what a culturally responsive evaluation might look like. Frierson, Hood, and Hughes (forthcoming) argue that it is essential for evaluations to consider cultural context, particularly when evaluating programs in culturally diverse communities but also offer strategies that may result in evaluations that are likely to be culturally responsive. The presenter will discuss the strategies offered by Frierson, Hood, and Hughes and how they might be considered when conducting evaluations in the African American community.

The Need for Cultural Considerations in Evaluation: Cases from Indian Country
Presenter Sharon Nelson-Barber, WestEd
Abstract All cultures generate knowledge as they create systems to impose order on the natural world. Cultures’ approaches to problem-solving, ways to differentiate, classify, and interpret the natural phenomena experienced or observed are different. Learning styles are also affected by environment
and closely linked to the demands of daily life. In fact, "competence" might be said to depend on the match between the demands of a task, the context in which it is embedded, and the culturally-developed skills of the learner. Like any group, indigenous children are acculturated to the values that guide their understanding of mathematics, science, and other disciplines in their home communities. Often during evaluation, potentially important content knowledge goes unrecognized, and critical opportunities to build on or draw from indigenous students' existing knowledge are missed. This presentation will discuss ways in which ways of knowing, learning, and problem solving can be utilized in analyses of these contexts.

**Culturally Relevant Evaluation for Hispanics: Context, Myths, and Guiding Principles**

**Presenter**  
Carlos Rodriguez, American Institutes for Research

**Abstract**  
Culturally relevant and effective evaluation for Hispanics and other underrepresented minority students are grounded in contextual considerations, misconceptions and myths, and guiding principles. While minorities are quickly becoming the underrepresented majority, critical masses of Hispanic, as well as African American students are mathematically, scientifically and technologically illiterate. Much of the responsibility for improving academic success for these students rests on the evaluation of individual performance, and on the evaluation of programs designed to influence their academic achievement. Too often, current evaluation approaches reconstruct stereotypes and deficit notions of minority student academic potential. Contextual considerations, misconceptions and myths, and guiding principles will be described to dispel insidious, popularized notions about minority students' abilities to learn science and mathematics that sabotage and derail any progress that program evaluations, policy, research and practice put forth. Recommendations that address how individual level and program evaluation can improve science and mathematics achievement will be offered.

**Collaborative, Participatory and Empowerment Approaches to Evaluating Professional Development and Degree Programs for Educators: A Teacher Education and Professional Development Focus**

MultiPaper Session 760 to be held in the Potomac V room

**Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**  
Sanjeev Sridharan, Westat

**A Collaborative Evaluation Model for Systemic Renewal of Teacher Education**

**Presenters**  
Joseph M Petrosko, University of Louisville

Marco A Munoz, Jefferson County Public Schools

**Abstract**  
This paper describes an evaluation model developed collaboratively by three partners that are important to the success of teacher education: university-based researchers, school district researchers, and representatives of a teacher union. The model has been used to evaluate the use of Professional Development Schools (PDS) in teacher education. The model employs quantitative and qualitative data and is flexible enough to be used by practitioners in both education and training and development. Data from 10 schools analyzed to date reveal that effects of PDS are most likely to be classroom-specific and not school-wide.

**Evaluation of a Community-wide, Professional Development, Systems Reform Initiative**

**Presenters**  
Graciela Couchonnal, Center for Information and Resources for Development

Edith M Freeman, University of Kansas

**Abstract**  
This paper describes the evaluation process used with a professional development-systems reform initiative for providers of early childhood education. The presentation explains how the evaluation was influenced by the initiative's development and evolved from a traditional research investigation for generating knowledge to a participatory evaluation for the purpose of informing program improvements and systems reforms. Participatory evaluation methods consisted of involving consumers in identifying priorities, clarifying evaluation questions, establishing outcomes, interpreting data, making data-based decisions, and connecting processes to outcomes (Patton, 1997). Findings indicate that this approach contributed to the consumers' leadership development, effective planning and coordination of the initiative, and increased awareness and achievement of necessary systems reforms. The implications for evaluation theory and practice are presented based on this example of user-focused evaluation and the documentation of systems processes.

**Evaluation Partnerships in Transformation Programs: An Application of Empowerment Evaluation**

**Presenter**  
Cynthia Tyska, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

**Abstract**  
The Illinois Professional LearnersÆ Partnership (IPLP) is a five-year, Federally-funded Teacher Quality Enhancement grant. IPLP unites five Illinois universities in a partnership intended to transform their respective teacher education programs. Approximately 25 different projects are funded within this partnership, each project developed independently of the others in intent, process, and outcome. With a demand, but no funds for, a systematic, project-wide evaluation, how does an external evaluator realize an effective and meaningful program-wide evaluation? This paper discusses steps taken to accomplish the latter through: (1) an evaluation partnership team; (2) evaluation instruments developed by the team; (3) an evaluation approach that systematically examines the 25 autonomous projects; (4) impact of evaluation results on the IPLP partnership project; (5) implications for sustainability
of evaluation practice.

**A Case for Participatory Evaluation: The PT3 Grant - Magnetic Connections**

**Presenters**  
Mildred Murray-Ward, California Lutheran University  
Beverly Bryde, California Lutheran University  
Paul Gathercoal, California Lutheran University  
James Mahler, California Lutheran University  
Wendy Erlanger, California Lutheran University  
Veronic Virgen-Heim, California Lutheran University  
Carol Bartell, California Lutheran University

**Abstract**  
The purpose of this session is to describe the impact of the participatory evaluation of CLUÆs US DoE PT3 technology teacher-training project, MAGNETIC CONNECTIONS, conducted from fall 1999 to spring 2002. The project was designed to train faculty in use of technology and redesign the teacher preparation program to include technology use in pre-service teachersÆ coursework and their own classrooms. The participatory evaluation involved faculty in a number of research roles including training and experiences in instrument development, data collection, and analysis. The results presented at this session will show the systemic impact of participatory evaluation design on the entire School of Education facultyÆs research and teaching and changes in pre-service teachersÆ skills in using technology in their own schools. In addition, issues surrounding completion of participatory evaluations in higher education settings will be discussed.

**Methodologies for Evaluating Services for Individuals with Disabilities**

**MultiPaper Session 761 to be held in the Potomac VI room**

**Sponsored by the Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG**

**Chair**  
Linda B Schrader, Florida State University

**Evaluation in a Legal Context: A Melding of Evaluation Approaches**

**Presenters**  
Linda B Schrader, Florida State University

**Abstract**  
Over the last 30 years, litigation has served as the impetus for improving the quality of life for individuals with disabilities residing in institutions and in community homes. Evaluations conducted in these settings pose a unique challenge to the evaluator as she negotiates a balance between the competing interests of stakeholders and implementing a sound evaluation. This presentation will discuss the evaluation methodology used to assess the quality of care provided to individuals with developmental disabilities and the challenges encountered in designing evaluations in this high stakes environment. The benefits of incorporating multiple evaluation approaches as a means for strengthening the legitimacy of the evaluation study also will be discussed.

**Evaluation of Multisystemic Therapy (MST): Implications for the Implementation of Evidence-based Treatments for Children with Serious Emotional and Behavioral Problems**

**Presenters**  
Lois Lynn Sbyko Deuel, University of California at San Francisco  
Abram Rosenblatt, University of California at San Francisco

**Abstract**  
A 1994 federal consent decree required the Hawaii State Departments of Health and Education to provide coordinated and appropriate educational and mental health services to all children eligible under federal law. Multisystemic Therapy (MST) was selected by the state for children with severe emotional and behavioral problems. Several clinical trials and controlled studies have established the efficacy of MST for children and youth with serious antisocial behavior, emotional disturbance, and juvenile offenders. MST is characterized by low therapist caseload, 24/7 home-based services, and time-limited duration of treatment. This evaluation examines how systemic characteristics (program introduction and implementation strategies, the referral process and service capacity, monitoring and expenditures, and coordination among systems and agencies) and programmatic characteristics (staffing, training, supervision and consultation, model fidelity during service delivery, and cultural sensitivity) of public mental health services for children relate to quality of care and changes in functional outcomes in a real-world setting.

**Evaluating Specialist Health Provision for People with Learning Disabilities**

**Presenter**  
Dawn Lawson, University of Huddersfield

**Abstract**  
This paper will report on a study, which is evaluating a specialist health centre for people with learning disabilities in the North of England. A critical evaluation is being used, as the predominant focus was service user perceptions of the centre. The purpose of the evaluation is to gain the perspective of service users, and to identify the characteristics of the patients associated with the most positive health outcomes. A mixed method evaluation is being used. The different methodologies are; service user interviews (30), staff interviews (20), non-participant observation and analysis of records. Records will be examined and data extracted in order to carry out inferential statistics. Issues of informed consent and good communication are crucial.
Evaluation Across the Globe: Tools of the Trade
Panel Session 762 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG and the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair Robert E. Lahey, Centre of Excellence for Evaluation

Formative Evaluation of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Strategy at the National Level
Presenters Michael D. Williams, University of Wales Swansea
                  Paul Beynon-Davies, University of Wales Swansea

Abstract The growth of information and communications technology (ICT) is seen as critical to the future interests of modern information-based economies. Against this background, in 2001 the Welsh Assembly Government launched Cymru Ar-lein (Wales Online) û the information age strategy for Wales. Cymru Ar-lein intends to ensure that Wales takes full advantage of the ICT revolution, and is expected to play a vital role in the delivery of the AssemblyÆs key objectives of sustainable development, social inclusion, and equal opportunities. The strategy comprises five strands, and involves a collection of governmental and non-governmental institutions. This paper reports on the initial phase of the on-going strategy evaluation conducted by the authors in conjunction with the Welsh Assembly Government. Our initial (formative) evaluation activities were conducted as an integral part of strategy implementation, thus providing the Assembly with valuable constructive information on the management of cross-cutting themes and combined impact of multiple programs.

The Canadian Experience in Repositioning Evaluation in the Federal Government
Presenter Robert E. Lahey, Centre of Excellence for Evaluation

Abstract The Canadian federal government's new Evaluation Policy was implemented in April 2001 to reposition evaluation closer to management and the decision-making process in government. A Centre of Excellence for Evaluation (CEE) was created at that time to help facilitate implementation of the Policy across all federal departments and agencies. This session will outline the strategic approach developed by the CEE to carry out its mandate; its broad approach and activities in championing evaluation and the implementation of the new Policy across government; and the experience and results achieved over the first year and a half of Policy implementation.

Defining the Practice of Evaluation: The Competency Profile for the Evaluation Professional in the Canadian Federal Government
Presenter Nancy McMahon, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

Abstract With much of the focus of the new Evaluation Policy introduced (April 2001) by the Canadian federal government on 'repositioning evaluation', a key concern has centred on defining 'the practice of evaluation' in government. The Centre of Excellence for Evaluation (CEE), the organization created to assist the system with repositioning and Policy implementation, has developed a broad Community Development Strategy to address this. A fundamental piece has been research conducted to define the competencies associated with the evaluation endeavour within the context of the new Policy. This session will outline the specific competencies and expected behaviours identified by this work, for each of junior, intermediate and senior evaluators. Further, it will elaborate on ways the Competency Profile can and is being used, including the design of an internship program for entry-level evaluators in government.

Policy Evaluation in the Netherlands: Linking Budgets to Operations and Results
Presenter Peter Van der Knapp, Ministry of Finance

Abstract In Volume 66 of the International Review of Administrative Sciences, various attempts of various governments to implement performance management systems (including "value for money" and "best value" approaches) were described. Although it was acknowledged that there is no "holy grail" in this field, guest editor Arie Halachmi pressed us to continue the search. This article reflects recent endeavours of the Netherlands central government. In 2003, when the first "new style" departmental annual reports appear, the first phase of the Netherlands central government project "Results oriented Budgeting and Accountability" will be completed. Central government in the Netherlands will then be working with a new budgeting and accounting system, in which insight and a clear link between policy and finance are central. The importance of proper systematic evaluation research has been greatly increased by RBA. Nevertheless, the Netherlands Court of Audit recently noted that the way government "organises policy evaluation" leaves much to be desired. This paper reports on the way in which this criticism is being used within central government to improve the application of evaluation research & #61485; and that of achievement data. This involves, among other things, the integrated use of regular achievement data and periodical evaluation research as well as the quality requirements that are to be laid down for evaluation instruments. The aim of this paper is in particular to provide insight into the new regulation, "Central government achievement data and evaluation research", which will be in force for all departments as of 1 January 2002. The paper...
Outcomes Evaluation

Outcome-based Planning and Evaluation for Systems Reform Initiatives

Skill-building Workshop Session 763 to be held in the Tidewater room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair
J. Reisman, The Evaluation Forum
Presenters
J. Reisman, The Evaluation Forum
Eric Glaser, United Way of America
Session Abstract
Learn about an innovative approach to developing an outcome-based evaluation plan for community/systems level change. This model was introduced by United Way of America for their Success by Six initiative. Two applications of this model will be shared: (1) early childhood systems change and (2) developing an out-of-school time system. Participants will engage in a hands-on learning opportunity for applying this model. Outcomes for the session include: 1. Participants will recognize the importance of starting with target population outcomes when designing community/systems change strategies. 2. Participants will understand the main elements of a community/systems change outcome-based planning and evaluation model.

Philanthropy and Evaluation: Enhancing Effective Use

Think Tank Session 764 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Facilitators
Norm Constantine, Public Health Institute
J. Kay Slater, Public Health Institute
Marc Braverman, University of California at Davis
Gary T. Henry, Georgia State University
Session Abstract
This session will provide a forum for discussion and analysis of the use of evaluation by foundations. Three questions will be addressed: (1) What are the special characteristics of foundation environments that affect the evaluation process? (2) To what extent is the potential value of evaluation to foundations being achieved? (3) How can effective evaluation use by foundations be enhanced? The session will begin with an overview by the chair, followed by three co-facilitators each providing a background summary for one of the above questions. Participants will divide into question-specific groups for 15 minute discussions. The full group will re-convene to discuss the conclusions reached by each of the three groups. A second breakout will follow, with participants in different question discussion groups. The full group will again re-convene, hear from each question group, and continue further discussion. The session will end with a commentary by one of the co-facilitators.

Evaluation And Systems Change During Challenging Times

Panel Session 765 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair
Paul Florin, University of Rhode Island
Discussant
Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University
Presenters
Kathy Whelpley, The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
Martin Mellett, The Community Development Support Collaborative
Gregory Taylor, Fannie Mae Foundation
Kien S. Lee, Association for the Study and Development of Community
Session Abstract
Leaders from various organizations operating in the Washington metropolitan area, including a Community Foundation, a community organization, and a funding collaborative, will discuss how evaluation can be used to guide program development and decisionmaking. These organizations and their work are affected by the larger context within which they operate such as tensions among different racial and ethnic groups, lack of infrastructure for community economic development, budget cuts, etc. Such issues affect the goals and use of evaluation (e.g., the Community Foundation used evaluation to develop and disseminate knowledge about building intergroup relations; the community organization used evaluation to inform its annual strategic planning; and the funding collaborative used the evaluation to learn more about local policies affecting the work of Community Development Corporations). The evaluator for all three organizations will share the strengths and challenges of the evaluations that were intentionally designed to effect change through collective reflection, ongoing learning, and informed decisionmaking to improve program and organizational effectiveness.

Evaluation 2002: Saturday, November 9, 11:25 am to 12:55 am
Addressing the Needs of the Substance Abuse Treatment Workforce: A Review of Regional Efforts and The Need for a National Survey

Panel Session 766 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair Paula K Horvatich, Virginia Commonwealth University

Abstract Substance abuse treatment providers are a diverse and expansive group. Multiple levels and types of treatment are being provided across the United States, in multiple different setting. Treatment providers are from various backgrounds, many in recovery themselves, with varying degrees of education and certification. Many critical issues are currently affecting the substance abuse treatment workforce including certification standards, salary, stigma, and retention/recruitment. These issues need to be addressed, but little information is currently available. Groups such as the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) and CSAT funded Addiction Technology Transfer Centers (ATTC’s) are aware of this need for information, and are taking action. Regional ATTC’s have initiated regional workforce surveys, while CSAT has taken the lead on initiating a national workforce survey. The call for a national survey effort will be discussed, as will results and challenges from two regional survey efforts by the Mountain West ATTC and the Northwest Frontier ATTC.

Addressing Substance Abuse Treatment Workforce Issues: The Need for a Cohesive National Survey

Presenter Paula K Horvatich, Virginia Commonwealth University

Abstract The Substance Abuse Treatment Workforce presents multiple issues and challenges, which have rarely, if ever, been addressed as a whole. In 1999 as part of its overall effort to develop a national treatment plan, the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment convened the Workforce Issues Panel (the Panel) to undertake the first comprehensive analysis of workforce issues and to make recommendations that could serve as an agenda for improving the workforce in the 21st century. Independent substance abuse agencies and/or stakeholder groups have collected data on the workforce. As a result there are areas in which the field has information on specific staff groups. However, these data do not lend themselves to comparison and cannot be consolidated to obtain a national picture. Hence, the Panel noted that there is no current national, common workforce repository of substance abuse treatment staff data. Lack of data hindered the PanelÆs attempts to analyze and address problems in the workforce. The Panel emphasized the need for new and cohesive precursory data collection as well as for effective secondary research.

Northwest Frontier Addiction Technology Transfer Center (NFATTC) Workforce Survey 2002: Assessing the Characteristics, Needs and Interests of the Substance Abuse Treatment Workforce

Presenters Jeffrey RW Knudsen, RMC Research Corporation
Richard Gabriel, RMC Research Corporation

Abstract Providers of substance abuse treatment services are as varied as the hues on a color wheel. Operating in residential, hospital, outpatient, detoxification and day treatment settings, they utilize a variety of treatment models and methods. States differ significantly in their rules for defining the essential elements of the service delivery system, practice procedures, and minimum qualifications for administrative and direct service personnel. These issues of staff diversity, service variation and inconsistency of practice standards present significant challenges to the substance abuse treatment workforce. In response to these challenges, the NFATTC initiated a regional workforce survey conducted by RMC Research Corporation. In this presentation, we will discuss the process and challenges of conducting a regional needs assessment in the 5 states comprising the NFATTC: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. The replication process as well as results from both the Workforce Survey 2000 and the recent Workforce Survey 2002 will be discussed.

Mountain West Addiction Technology Transfer (MWATTC) Workforce Study Survey

Presenters Nancy A Roget, University of Nevada at Reno
Richard T Bissett, University of Nevada at Reno
Michael M Warner, University of Nevada at Reno

Abstract The MWATTC conducted a survey of the addiction counseling workforce in Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming. Two thousand surveys were mailed to addiction counselors using the mailing lists of the licensing and certification boards in each state. 641 individuals responded to the survey representing a 32% return rate. The intent of the survey was to 1) collect demographic data on counselors that would be helpful in designing technology transfer initiatives, 2) determine career plans and paths of the workforce for the region, and 3) gather data regarding workforce shortages, career
ladders, perceptions of the field, etc. Initial data analysis demonstrates several career trends that have both regional and national implications. For the presentation, MWATTC Evaluators will speak to the survey (instrument) design, methodology, and data analysis issues. The MWATTC Project Director will discuss the implications and utility of the study results for training and educational (academic) program planning.

Frameworks for Conducting Evaluation in International Settings

MultiPaper Session 767 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair: Mary B Church, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

Inculcating a Systemic Evaluation Process Through External Evaluation: The Case of the Amazonian

Presenters: Thereza Penna-Firme, Cesgrainrio Foundation
Vathsala I Stone, State University of New York at Buffalo
Juan Antonio Tijiboy, Federal University of Porto Alegre Brazil
Helenice Maia Goncalves, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
Thomaz K Chianca, Communication and Evaluation Inc

Abstract: This paper describes the external evaluation of the Brazilian Amazonian Education Program funded by Raytheon Corporation. Using a responsive approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Abma & Stake, 2001) and engaging the stakeholders through every step of the evaluative process, the evaluation team gained credibility with the program participants. Beyond recognizing their own strengths and weaknesses in the results of the SWOT (Worthen, Sanders & Fitzpatrick, 1997) analysis, the participants became aware of a need to strengthen their internal evaluation capacity and to use evaluation results as a way to sustain themselves and their partner organizations beyond the funding period, and eventually to achieve the intended system reforms in the region. The external evaluation team is now playing a dual role in the program: build the program's internal evaluation capacity through systematic guidance and metaevaluation (Scriven: In Stufflebeam, 2001) and help them track program impacts and use results for systems change.

The International Value of Tracer Evaluations: At What Cost, Time and Effort?

Presenter: Mark D Bardini, The World Bank

Abstract: The basic message of the presentation will be to first discuss what a tracer evaluation is and how important it can be while evaluating the impacts of international programs. In particular, the presenter will relate how tracer studies are similar and dissimilar to impact studies and why tracer studies should be more mainstreamed in any organization. A discussion of the special concerns, costs, challenges, time commitments and lessons learned in utilizing tracer evaluations will also be central topics. Additionally, the paper (report) will discuss the evaluation design, constraints, and outcomes of two tracer evaluations conducted by the presenter as part of his work at the World Bank. It will also report whether the objectives of the tracer evaluations were met and how the evaluation results may help to improve future activities of their nature at the World Bank.

Anti-corruption Policies and Programs: A Framework for Evaluation

Presenters: Anwar Shah, The World Bank
Jeff Hiuther, The World Bank

Abstract: This paper provides a framework for evaluating anti-corruption policies and programs in developing countries. The paper argues that path dependency is critical in determining the relevance and relative efficacy of various anti-corruption programs. For example, in a largely corruption free environment, anti-corruption agencies, ethics offices and ombudsman serve to enhance the standards of accountability. In countries with endemic corruption, the same institutions serve a function in form only and not in substance. Under a best case scenario, these institutions might be helpful but the more likely outcome is that they help to preserve the existing system of social injustice.

Even Start, Local Evaluation, and Systems Change

MultiPaper Session 768 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair: Marilyn L Ray, Finger Lakes Law & Social Policy Center Inc

The True Learnings of Evaluation

Presenter: Jeanne M Crane, Crane Associates Inc

Abstract: This paper will discuss what an evaluator can do to help program staff move "beyond the buzz words" of evaluation to a deeper level of learning and of application. It will include a model this evaluator has used to develop an understanding of evaluation among Even Start staffs, to bring TQM to
private and public sector organizations, and to facilitate effective learning transfer. Specific illustrations and examples will be offered. Not all evaluators are trainers nor is it appropriate for any evaluator to get enmeshed in staff development. However, we have an obligation to make sure that the tools and concepts we use are truly understood by those we evaluate. Furthermore, we have an opportunity to empower service-providers to own the process of continuous improvement. This can even lead to the creation of a learning organization.

Tell Us to Do More of What We Already Like: Limits to Receptivity of TTell Us to Do More of What We Already Like: Limits to Receptivity of TQMQMQMQM----Suggested Change

Presenter
Janet Spitz, The College of Saint Rose

Systems Within Systems: What's an Evaluator to Do?
Presenter
Dianne Apter, Syracuse University

The New York State Even Start Longitudinal Evaluation Project: Continuous Program Improvement and Systems Change
Presenter
Marilyn L Ray, Finger Lakes Law & Social Policy Center Inc

---

TIG Business Meeting and Presentation: Presenting Your Results to Clients

Business Meeting Session 769 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG

TIG Leaders
George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services
Deborah F Holmes, US Department of Commerce
obert Vito, US Department of Health and Human Services

Session Chair
George F Grob, US Department of Health and Human Services

Presenters
Demetra Arapakos, US Department of Health and Human Services
Thomas F Komaniecki, US Department of Health and Human Services

Session Abstract
The exit conference affords an opportunity to extend a courtesy to your client by providing an advance copy of the draft report they will be formally receiving; obtain early client feedback on findings and recommendations; and discuss and resolve issues with the client. Two experienced facilitators of exit conference presentations of evaluation results will lead the discussion. Topics to be covered include: * See every meeting as an opportunity to market your ideas and yourself * Getting listened to in meetings and around the conference table* Your magic "eight seconds" - make your introductory sentence count* A strong closing is a strategic element of your presentation* What to leave out when you don't have enough time* Anticipating difficult questions, comments and people

A Systematic Look at Business and Industry Evaluation Practices

MultiPaper Session 770 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG

Chair
Vanessa Moss-Summers, Xerox Corporation

Somewhere, Out There:  A Survey of the Oft Lone Journey of Evaluators Working in Business and Industry
Presenter
Vanessa Moss-Summers, Xerox Corporation

Abstract
Little is documented in the evaluation literature concerning the whereabouts, competencies, methods, and tools used by evaluation practitioners in the for-profit sector. The difficulty of finding corporate evaluator colleagues is well known. The lack of a recognized community of such practitioners is well understood. Given this lack of community, little has been contributed to advance the science of evaluation methodology and the art of evaluation practice. Results from an exhaustive search for and survey of corporate evaluation practitioners will be shared. The purposes of the survey are to: 1)Describe the areas of the organization in which evaluators are typically found; 2)Identify the models and methods of evaluation known to and used by the practitioner; 3)Discover attempts to build evaluation systems; 4)Document instances in which existing models have been adapted or new ones created; 5)Identify case studies and best practices; 6)Propose areas of collaborative opportunity.

Theory Thwarts Practice: The Difficult Fit of Current Evaluation Theory in Business and Industry
Presenter
Sharon Marie May, Compaq Computer Corporation

Best Practices and Emerging Issues in Corporate Evaluation
Presenter
Trude Fawson, Training Impact Group Inc

Building a Collegial Base
Presenter
Sharon Marie May, Compaq Computer Corporation
Using Models of Influence in Oral Health: CDC’s Oral Health Program

Presenter: S Rene Lavinghouze, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Abstract: Many states lack public health infrastructure to assess oral health needs and implement proven oral disease preventive programs. We describe the process by which the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Division of Oral Health is developing a system dynamics model to examine the far-reaching influence of small amounts of grant money provided to state health departments to improve their oral health systems. This model views influence as a complex series of feedback loops through a chain of causes and effects to predict how a system will be affected. Thirteen state grantees programs are evaluated to develop details of and model the sectors influenced either indirectly or directly by grant monies. Ultimately, this project hopes to provide a basis to demonstrate how influence works in the reference environment. It is also hoped that our systems model can be applied as a decision support tool for state oral health infrastructure planning.
Session Abstract: Just as evaluation is shaped by the systemic context in which it is embedded, so too are the AEA affiliates. This session explores these contextual influences with the key question: What does affiliation with AEA mean? The question is explored from the perspectives of both the affiliates and the AEA. Four geographically and structurally diverse affiliates will explore the key question of affiliation, as well as the influence of context on their affiliate. The president-elect of AEA will explore the meaning of affiliation from the perspective of the national organization. All AEA affiliates are invited discussants in the conversation with panel members and the AEA president-elect. The overall intent of the session is to better understand the systemic influences on evaluation organizations and to explore the implications of multiple meanings of affiliation on relationships among organizations.

**Affiliation: A View from the San Francisco Bay Area**

**Presenter:** Saumitra Sengupta, City & County of San Francisco

**Abstract:** This presentation will explore the meaning of "affiliation" with AEA and related contextual influences from the perspective of this affiliate after consultation with its members.

**Affiliation: A View from the Eastern Evaluation Research Society**

**Presenter:** Laura Blankertz, Matrix Research Institute

**Abstract:** This presentation will explore the meaning of affiliation with AEA and related contextual influences from the perspective of this affiliate after consultation with its members.

**Affiliation: A View from the Michigan Association for Evaluation**

**Presenter:** Jeffrey Padden, Public Policy Associates Inc

**Abstract:** This presentation will explore the meaning of affiliation with AEA and related contextual influences from the perspective of this affiliate after consultation with its members.

**Affiliation: A View from the Arizona Evaluation Network**

**Presenter:** Stephen Powers, Creative Research Associates

**Abstract:** This presentation will explore the meaning of affiliation with AEA and related contextual influences from the perspective of this affiliate after consultation with its members.

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**Non-traditional Ways of Teaching Evaluation**

**MultiPaper Session 773 to be held in Ballroom B**

**Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG**

**Chair:** Gregory Washington, Clark Atlanta University

**Community Service-learning as a Model Approach in Social Advocacy and Systems Change: Training Evaluators Responsive to Needs of Minority Communities**

**Presenters:** Theresa A Salazar, RMC Research Corporation

Jesse Valdez, University of Denver

Lizanne DeStefano, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Abstract:** This paper proposes developing curricula with active service-learning components to enhance the process and quality of teaching graduate students in Program Evaluation. Case examples and evaluation results of a curriculum at the University of Denver that incorporates service-learning, evaluation, and social action research are reviewed. Research is also reviewed which demonstrates the outcomes in incorporating service-learning pedagogy into curricula. These outcomes include increased 1) cultural competency, 2) effectiveness in developing effective interventions and programs for underserved populations, 3) awareness of social and economic issues 4) providing context in application of theory to practice (O'Sullivan & Lasso, 1992; De La Cancela & Guzman, 1991). This approach is comprehensive in community care as well as training well-rounded professionals who are prepared to meet the needs of the growing multicultural population. Community-academic partnerships offer the means of creating systemic change in academic institutions, communities, and in government public policy.

**They Started Talking about Rabbits, but I Made them Stop: Analyzing the Content and Evolution of Student Contributions to Online Office Hours**

**Presenter:** Merrill Chandler, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Abstract:** This presentation explores the nature of weekly office hour chats in the development of evaluation knowledge and understanding among master's students in a graduate online program at the University of Illinois. In online office hours, students discuss important (and not so important, thus the title) issues of planning, designing, implementing evaluations. Students also discuss issues of collecting and analyzing data, reporting and developing a meta-
evaluation strategy. This presentation will discuss student's understandings of program evaluation both at the beginning and end of the course drawing on chat logs and other course artifacts (assignments, evaluation proposals and final reports) for analysis. We will explore student's engagement and the instructors role in online chats to come to a more developed understanding about the role of online discussions in teaching about program evaluation, the political nature of evaluation, establishing and developing the relationship with the client and peer support/review during the evaluation process.

**Merging Evaluation into a Non-traditional Curriculum: Lessons Learned**

*Presenter:* Chanda D Elbert, Texas A&M University

*Abstract:* Merging Evaluation into a Non-Traditional Undergraduate Curriculum: Lessons Learned. Generally the agricultural education curriculum has focused on teaching, leadership, extension education, agricultural communication and agricultural journalism. Merging the ideals of evaluation into this curriculum has been beneficial for the students upon completing their education. Creating an undergraduate evaluation course for spring semester 2002 was both challenging and rewarding. The challenges involved with this endeavor included choosing a textbook for the course, developing a course syllabus, assisting identifying programs and organizations to evaluate, and assessing final projects. In addition, bringing in experienced evaluators who have worked with Cooperative Extension, International Programs and Grant Writing assisted with students learning about the various roles of evaluators. During the semester, the development of evaluation projects involved students working with their stakeholders. The final evaluation reports included topics ranging from traditional campus programs to private run businesses.

---

**Performance-based Evaluation: A Theory-based Evaluation Model Derived from the Discipline of Human Performance Technology**

*Demonstration Session 775 to be held in Ballroom D*

*Sponsored by the Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation TIG*

*Chair:* Barbara A Bichelmeyer, Indiana University

*Presenters:* Barbara A Bichelmeyer, Indiana University

*Session Abstract:* In this session, presenters will demonstrate the Performance-Based Evaluation Model, which is based on assumptions derived from the field of Human Performance Technology. Specifically, the Performance-Based Evaluation Model builds on the basic assumption from the field of Human Performance Technology that human performance in any context is a function of four key performance variables: inherent capacity, skill/knowledge, motivation/incentive, and environmental support. The presenters will explain the guiding assumptions of the Performance-Based Evaluation Model, overview the evaluation protocol and evaluation method, provide a case review of the performance-based evaluation of a web-based distance Masters' Degree program, briefly discuss the findings from the evaluation, engage in a critique of the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation model, and consider issues regarding the most appropriate applications of the model and issues for further development of the model.

---

**Creating and Using a Web-based Data Collection Site as an Evaluation Tool**

*Demonstration Session 776 to be held in the Washington A room*

*Sponsored by the Computer Use in Evaluation TIG*

*Chair:* John Enger, Barry University

*Discussant:* James Kramer, Independent Consultant

*Presenters:* Candace Lacey, Independent Consultant

Mary Kay Bacallao, St Thomas University

*Session Abstract:* This demonstration focuses on an evaluator-disigned web-site that is being used to collect quantitative data for a grant evaluation. This presentation cover the impetus for the project design, an overview of the design framework, and a demonstration of the technology used to create the site. The demonstration will also include a discussion of the make-up of the project team, issues of confidentiality, and concerns about data validity and reliability.

---

**Increasing the Quality and Rigor of Educational Evaluation: Issues and Implications of the U.S. Department of Education's Strategic Plan, 2002-2007**
Think Tank Session 777 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chairs Patricia A Muller, Indiana University
Kim K Metcalf, Indiana University
Facilitators Ronald A Beghetto, Indiana University
Radhika Rajgopal, Indiana University
Dan Henry, Indiana University
Jacqueline Singh, Indiana University

Session Abstract The purpose of this think tank is to provide a forum for discussing the impact and implications of the recently released draft of the US Department of Education's (DOE) Strategic Plan, 2002-2007, on the field of educational evaluation. Specifically, the discussion will focus on the stated goal (Goal 4) of transforming education into an evidence-based field by increasing the quality and rigor of department-funded research, including the increased use of randomized experimental designs. The session chairperson will provide the background and relevant context regarding the Strategic Plan, and individual breakout groups will address various facets of this issue, including: What is the feasibility and practicality of implementing randomized designs in education? What are the implications of employing randomized experimental designs? What does it mean to increasing the ‘quality and rigor’ of educational evaluation? What are the implications of this strategic plan on the field of educational evaluation more generally?

Establishing Linkages and Showing Success: Methods for Working with Human Services Providers Who are Inexperienced with Evaluation
Demonstration Session 778 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG
Facilitator Jennifer Taub, University of Massachusetts

Session Abstract This session is for evaluators who work with human services providers who have little experience with evaluation and little exposure to the language of evaluation. The presentation will be based on a workshop that was found to be useful to human services providers who had little or no experience with evaluation. We will discuss exercises that help to teach evaluation concepts such as goals, objectives, indicators, qualitative evaluation, process evaluation and consumer satisfaction. Also discussed will be how to help program staff understand the rationales for evaluation, and how to use evaluation to show outcomes for their programs, help them better understand the work they do, and aid them when applying for program funding. It is hoped that attendees of this presentation will come away with useful resources, ideas and exercises for working with staff unfamiliar with the language and process of human services evaluation.

Meta-methodology for Meta-programs
MultiPaper Session 779 to be held in the Potomac II room
Sponsored by the Cluster, Multi-site and Multi-level Evaluation TIG

Evaluability of Multi-site Community-based Service Integration Initiatives
Presenter William R Holcomb, Behavioral Health Concepts Inc

Abstract Evaluators may find themselves in a position of evaluating outcomes of programs that are defined in such a way that they do not lend themselves to summative evaluation approaches. This often occurs in complex, multi-site evaluations with stakeholders at local, regional, and policy levels that are involved as consumers, direct service professionals, and/or managers. These stakeholders have diverse perspectives, and when coupled with several sources of funding, can result in programs that are not amenable to summative evaluation methods. The present paper describes some of the issues involved in identifying program outcomes in multi-site, community-based service integration initiatives, and the possible approaches to be taken in conducting evaluations that are relevant to stakeholders and decision makers. A real state-wide evaluation example will be used to illustrate approaches to describing program interventions, target populations, and system processes when complex and multi-site programs are being evaluated.

The Symbiotic Nature of Systems Change Evaluation
Presenter Glen Martin, Glen Martin Associates

Abstract Designing and implementing a cluster evaluation model for a multisite U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) State Improvement Grant program quickly revealed the interplay of the contextual systemic effects on evaluation and the evaluation's effects on state and local systems. This paper explores the definitions of systems change and examines the particular aspects of the cluster evaluation model.
that led to a dynamic, on-going evaluation both impacted by and affecting multiple systemic contexts.

It's the Story That Counts: Story-based Approaches to Empowerment Through Evaluation

Demonstration Session 780 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Qualitative Methods TIG
Facilitators  David M Scheie, Rainbow Research Inc
            Joan A Othieno, Rainbow Research Inc
Session Abstract  Not all organizations want stronger measurement as the primary benefit of evaluation. Sometimes they want to get better at collecting, integrating and using stories. This session will describe circumstances in which an organization might prefer a story-based evaluation over a measurement-based one. It will present the elements of a good story, methods for collecting information and generating and integrating stories, and a package of activities and products that enable a story-based evaluation to be useful and empowering. Challenges and limitations faced in story-based approaches will be considered. Competencies required to do story-based evaluation will be identified. The session will draw on Rainbow Research's experience in planning and co-conducting evaluations with neighborhood associations, community organizing projects, and grassroots youth enrichment and informal learning programs - particularly one case in which a logic-model outcomes measurement approach was discarded in favor of generating case vignettes, newspaper feature articles, and other story-based methods.

Empowerment Evaluation: The Use of Digital Movies and the Web to Combat Academic Distress and Get to Outcomes

Panel Session 781 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG
Chair  David Fetterman, Stanford University
Session Abstract  High-tech tools have been useful in facilitating empowerment evaluations. The tools range from digital photographs and movies to entire web-based systems. A case example of an empowerment evaluation in the Arkansas Delta, where school districts are in academic distress, highlights the use of some of these tools, particularly in the areas of: data collection, analysis, and mobilizing community support. Another team of empowerment evaluators have developed an interactive web-based system for the Getting To Outcomes results-based accountability approach. This example represents a step beyond the norm in knowledge utilization because the technology helps bring many of the facets together in one information technology system. Although technology is only a tool in the process of facilitating empowerment evaluations, it helps bridge gaps, overcome obstacles, and speak volumes to the larger community.

Empowerment Evaluation and Academic Distress in the Arkansas Delta: From Cotton Fields to Digital Movies (mpegs)

Presenter  David Fetterman, Stanford University
Abstract  The Arkansas Department of Education requested an empowerment evaluation in order to respond to academic distress in two Delta unified school districts. Districts are placed on an academic distress list by the State when over 50% of the students are performing at the 25% percentile on standardized tests. This and other indicators prompted the request for an evaluation. The record of State takeovers in academic distress conditions is not impressive. Firing everyone was also unrealistic. Immediately replacing teachers and administrators in these rural, low-income schools was considered problematic at best. In addition, a take over would ignore the untapped potential in the school and community. An empowerment evaluation was selected because of its focus on building capacity. The evaluation and improvement plans were conducted in two stages. The first involved a need assessment in which a 19 member needs assessment team diagnosed district problems and made recommendations to the State. The recommendations focused on a partnership between the districts and the State. Surgical intervention was also recommended concerning the Board, discipline, curriculum and instruction. The needs assessment created a context for the formal phase of this self- or empowerment evaluation. This second phase included an empowerment evaluation workshop to enhance buy-in and generate a baseline. Community education and mobilization was also an instrumental part of the process of revitalization. Technology, including digital pictures and movies, proved invaluable in data collection, analysis, and mobilizing support in this venture.

Empowerment Evaluation: A Web Based System for Getting to Outcomes

Presenters  Abraham Wandersman, University of South Carolina
            Xiaoyan Zhang, Kitsolutions
Abstract  We are developing an interactive web-based system for the Getting To Outcomes results-based accountability approach. The system goes a major step further to achieve knowledge utilization by embedding prevention theory, methodology, and knowledge base in a concrete information technology system, by providing structure and logic that guide practitioners to implement science-based prevention programs, and by integrating the entire prevention programming from needs assessment, planning, service tracking, to evaluation and sustainability in one system.
System Integration and Network Analysis
MultiPaper Session 782 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Human Services Evaluation TIG
Chair Margaret L Polinsky, Parents Anonymous Inc

Complex Public Service Evaluation: A Network Approach
Presenters Kimberly A Fredericks, State University of New York at Albany
                  Joanne G Carman, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract In today’s complex environment, social service programs are being delivered by a multitude of service providers. Given recent trends of government reinvention and devolution, more non-profit and public agencies are coordinating and delivering multifarious services. These trends have given rise to the development of complex institutional and political networks among social service providers, where formal and informal inter-organizational relationships between funders, program implementers, regulators, evaluators, and the community are critical to organizational survival. Along with this increasingly complicated and challenging environment, service providers are being asked to provide higher quality assurance and improved program evaluation. This paper suggests that evaluators use a network approach to program analysis, whereby all stakeholders can be identified and included in the evaluation, and the nature of the program can be elicited. Such analysis will provide evaluators with a deeper understanding of the program and the ability to complete a more thorough and meaningful evaluation.

The System Integration Matrix: A Tool for Describing the Status of System Integration Efforts
Presenter Deborah L Sherwood, San Francisco County Mental Health Services
Abstract Integrating service systems to better serve clients has become a mantra in human service agencies. While the virtues of integration are extolled, there have been surprisingly few efforts to measure whether "integration" is really happening. A simple tool for gaining insight into how integrated service partners view the integration effort is the System Integration Matrix. The matrix is constructed with 8 dimensions of system integration on the vertical axis (Commitment, Planning, Training, Leadership Patterns, Human Resources, Funding, Impact, and Communications), and definitions of each dimension at different stages of integration (Informal Relations, Coordination, Partnership, Collaboration, and Integration) on the horizontal axis. Staff from different levels of each partner agency rate the integrated service effort on each dimension by checking the definition that best describes their level of integration. The matrix yields individual dimension and total integration scores, and can be used to track perspectives over time. An example of its use is provided using data from the San Francisco Children’s System of Care.

A Methodology for Conducting Participatory Evaluations of Special Education and Rehabilitation Programs
Expert Lecture Session 783 to be held in the Potomac VI room
Sponsored by the Evaluation of Services for Special Needs Populations TIG
Chair David R Johnson, University of Minnesota
Speakers David R Johnson, University of Minnesota
                  Darrell R Lewis, University of Minnesota
Session Abstract Special education and rehabilitation programs serving children, youth, and adults with disabilities are being held to new accountability standards, calling for improved evaluation methods. Participatory evaluation methods have become particularly important in the consensus-building necessary to define the outcomes individuals with disabilities shall achieve through special education and rehabilitation programs. Multiattribute utility (MAU) and multiattribute consensus-building (MACB) techniques in management sciences offer promising methods for examining questions concerning the efficacy of services for individuals with disabilities. This presentation examines these issues and presents a conceptual framework and methodology for use of MAU and MACB in evaluating special education and rehabilitation services. The methods and results of several studies conducted at the University of Minnesota will be presented by Drs. David R. Johnson, Associate Professor, and Darrell R. Lewis, Professor of Educational Policy and Administration. These researchers have conducted such evaluations for over a decade and published extensively on this work.

A Proposal for an Inclusive Approach to Program Evaluation: A Paradigm Expansion to Cope with the Increasing Complexity
Think Tank Session 784 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Session Abstract

We propose exploring the possibility of constructing a comprehensive evaluation approach, which builds on Stake's responsive evaluation and pre-ordinate evaluation (House, 2001), by adding an approach we call 'reformative.' The intent is to assist organizations as they adapt to their ever-changing environments. To achieve this, we will consider the assessment tools and techniques discussed in Greene & Abma's 'Responsive Evaluation', the New Directions for Evaluation, Winter 2001, and examine a variety of supplementary tools. The object is not to construct an eclectic approach, but a systematic framework in which to organize tools and techniques according to their functions, interactions, and appropriate usage relative to the life stage of the programs being evaluated. Tables and models will used to depict the complexity of relationships and interactions. To set the stage for our discussion, we will present a table, based on Wadsworth (2001), displaying comparisons of three sub-approaches: pre-ordinate, responsive and reformative.

Difficult Dialogues: Tactfully Communicating with Troublesome Clients

Skill-building Workshop Session 785 to be held in the Tidewater room

Sponsored by the Independent Consulting TIG

Chair

Lynda Sagrestano, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Presenters

Georgia K Hughes, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Germine H Awad, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Laura A Rowald, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Angela M Horvath, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Session Abstract

Communicating with the client can often present the biggest challenge in an evaluation, especially when the client is difficult, overly demanding, sexist, ageist, racist, or generally offensive. This workshop will provide evaluators with the opportunity to develop and practice diplomatic responses to difficult situations. Several potentially difficult client communication scenarios will be presented, and strategies for dealing with the challenges, taken from the literature and from personal experience, will be discussed. Scenarios will include how to respond to clients who: question the evaluator's ability on the basis of age, gender, or ethnicity; are not responsive; have an agenda for the evaluation. Participants will be asked to share personal experiences and approaches to communication. The workshop will also offer tactics and techniques for staying calm in the face of challenging clients. Workshop attendees will practice these techniques and will share successful communication strategies.

The Visual Display of Needs Assessment and Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat (SWOT) Analysis Data

Demonstration Session 786 to be held in the Kennedy room

Sponsored by the Needs Assessment TIG

Chair

Ryan Watkins, George Washington University

Presenter

Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University

Session Abstract

This presentation will introduce techniques for the visual display of needs assessment and SWOT analysis findings in an evaluation setting. First, conventional narrative and numeric methods of data presentation will be compared to visual counterparts. Next, conventions for the truthful representations of data using visual techniques will be introduced, followed by a discussion of techniques for collecting, analyzing and presenting needs assessment and SWOT analysis data using visual representations. Subsequently, the visual representation of needs assessment and SWOT analysis data will be demonstrated through participant involvement in a scenario-based example, followed by provision of templates for the collection and presentation of their own data in a visual format. Lastly, a discussion will be facilitated regarding the conversion of needs assessment and SWOT findings into visual displays, concluding with a question-and-answer session.

Innovative Mechanisms for Qualitative Description and Evaluation of Partnerships Involving Public Schools, Community and University Programs in Teacher Training

Panel Session 787 to be held in the Jefferson room
Assessing Aid at the Country Level

Panel Session 789 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair Ruben Lamdany, The World Bank
Session Abstract Evaluation at the World Bank has begun to emphasize outcomes at the country level over recent years. A major effort has been made to develop a consistent methodology that builds on a long history of project evaluation but adapts to the country context. At the 2001 AEA Annual Meeting the Operations Evaluation Department presented the methodology as it stood then and invited constructive comment. This panel examines the difficulties of moving from project to country level evaluation from the perspective of both the history of the work that has been done and remains to be done, and the experience of a recent evaluation of the development program in one of the most important countries, Russia.

Assessing Aid at the Country Level
Presenter John H Jonsson, The World Bank
Abstract Assessing the effectiveness of international aid has required that evaluators move from a focus on the impact of individual projects to the "higher plane" of country programs. Over the past seven years, the Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank has produced 52 evaluations of country programs, and has 15 more in progress. From this experience and its time-tested project methodology, OED has gradually crafted a methodology for country assistance evaluation. The presentation will discuss the challenges OED had to face and outline the unfinished agenda of self-evaluation, borrower evaluation, and joint donor evaluation which must be completed before country program evaluation can achieve its full potential.

Country Assistance Evaluation for Russia
Participatory Versus Traditional Approaches to Evaluation: Evaluating School Integration/Desegregation Plans in Adjoining Districts

Panel Session 790 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Barry B Cohen, Rainbow Research Inc
Session Abstract Rainbow Research has the unique opportunity to compare a participatory/empowerment approach to evaluation with a traditional approach in evaluating the outcomes of integration/desegregation projects at the same time in contiguous school districts. As evaluators we expect to learn from each approach what works best/least under what conditions in ways that will strengthen our practice and those of others. The presenters will examine how the different evaluations were shaped by the legal, political and social context in which they were embedded and how, if at all, the act of evaluating is having systemic impact on the school districts involved. The role of the school districts in framing evaluation questions, informing the selection of evaluation methods, directing evaluation efforts, and using evaluation findings will be compared and contrasted in the context of the respective approaches they hired Rainbow to employ.

Participatory Evaluation of A School District's Integration/Desegregation Plan: The Robbinsdale, Minnesota Experience

Presenter Barry B Cohen, Rainbow Research Inc
Abstract Rainbow Research is conducting a participatory evaluation of the Robbinsdale School's integration/desegregation plan. Starting with a plan to fulfill two goals and a set of activities, Rainbow has worked with stakeholders to develop a logic model. Outcomes and indicators were identified through many dozen stakeholder focus groups conducted by Rainbow trained volunteers and which Rainbow cross-validated with those in the evaluation literature. From these, Desegregation Council members constructed the model aligning outcomes with their plan's activities they believed are, e.g., measurable, attainable, and credible. The outcome assessment to follow will also be participatory, engaging stakeholders in all facets of the research with Rainbow in the roles of partner, coach, trainer and advisor. We will discuss why we took a participatory approach, how the evaluation is itself is designed to contribute to project outcomes, benefits/drawbacks of the approach and lessons learned for two other integration/desegregation plan evaluations Rainbow is conducting.

Traditional Evaluation of Two Integration/Desegregation Plans: The Experiences of Hopkins, Minnesota and The West Metro Education Project

Presenter T Williams, Rainbow Research Inc
Abstract Outcomes of integration/desegregation plans are also being assessed by Rainbow Research for the Hopkins Schools and for a collaborative of 10 Minneapolis metropolitan area districts. In Hopkins and in the collaborative, outcomes and indicators were identified through interviews Rainbow conducted with a less inclusive group of district and school administrators and program directors. As traditional evaluations, Rainbow is collecting most of the data, drawing upon available data districts' collect. The focus of the collaborative is on assessment, fulfilling terms of a legal settlement. We will juxtapose these evaluations with the participatory approach used in Robbinsdale. Why was the participatory approach used in one project and not the others? What are the benefits/challenges of each strategy? How are the lessons learned in one approach being applied to the other? How is the information being used differently and does this have any bearing on the intended outcomes or on community support?

Intricate Dances: Working with Difficult Program Managers

Skill-building Workshop Session 791 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Evaluation Managers and Supervisors TIG
Chair Laura J Collins, University of Washington
Presenters Laura J Collins, University of Washington
Jennifer Harris, Office of Educational Assessment
Tamara Walser, University of Washington
Session Abstract Whose role in program evaluation directly affects the evaluator's role? Working with program managers who are organized, thoughtful, and reliable makes the evaluator's job seems almost effortless. In other circumstances, working with a program manager who is scattered or unreliable and...
whose intentions are not easily understood creates a challenging situation. In this session, participants will attempt to describe this ‘intricate dance’ and the characteristics of difficult program managers. Then participants will design and share strategies for positive interactions.

**Showing Off: Forecasting Training ROI**
Demonstration Session 792 to be held in the Prince William room
Sponsored by the Business and Industry TIG
Facilitator Stacey LT Boyle, NETg
Session Abstract This presentation will introduce techniques for the visual display of needs assessment and SWOT analysis findings in an evaluation setting. First, conventional narrative and numeric methods of data presentation will be compared to visual counterparts. Next, conventions for the truthful representations of data using visual techniques will be introduced, followed by a discussion of techniques for collecting, analyzing and presenting needs assessment and SWOT analysis data using visual representations. Subsequently, the visual representation of needs assessment and SWOT analysis data will be demonstrated through participant involvement in a scenario-based example, followed by provision of templates for the collection and presentation of their own data in a visual format. Lastly, a discussion will be facilitated regarding the conversion of needs assessment and SWOT findings into visual displays, concluding with a question-and-answer session.
Presidential Strand

All Evaluation Is a Stage: Acting Out Organizational Challenges to Evaluation
Panel Session 798 to be held in Ballroom E
Sponsored by the Presidential Strand
Chair: Sharon F Rallis, University of Connecticut
Presenters: Molly Engle, Oregon State University
J A King, University of Minnesota
Michael Quinn Patton, Union Institute & University
Sharon F Rallis, University of Connecticut

Session Abstract: Evaluation both shapes and is shaped by the organizational contexts in which it functions. While we agree that evaluation informs the systems of an organization, we suggest that a non-rational perspective on organizations offers alternative roles and influences for evaluation. From this perspective, evaluation is seen as linking systems, defining boundaries, legitimizing and buffering, or as just one of the many agendas on the table. This alternative-format session will begin with the presenters role-playing one evaluation challenge seen through a non-rational perspective. The audience will then generate evaluation challenges they have faced in which the evaluation conflicted with or was hindered by the organizational systems, where the systems appeared to work against the evaluation (either internal or external). The panel will role-play interpretations and approaches for the proposed situations. The session will be interactive, drawing heavily on audience engagement as a source of systemic issues in organizations employing evaluation.

Conference Committee Strand

Assessing and Documenting Systems Change: Exploring the Three I Model of Evaluation
Panel Session 796 to be held in Ballroom C
Sponsored by the AEA Conference Committee
Chair: Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany

Session Abstract: This panel provides documentation of the usability of a model of evaluation for systems change and examples of its use in multiple settings. Funders are requesting evidence that the supporting system has changed and that programmatic efforts have become integrated into the infrastructure. At last year’s conference a model of evaluating systems change was introduced. Since that time, model development has concentrated on validating four dependent constructs and the methods used to assess them. The first presenter, Dianna Newman will overview the model and the classification of outcome measures. Lanaro will address its use in substance abuse areas; Lobosco will discuss the refinement of the constructs in programs supporting services to families and children with developmental disabilities; Spaulding, et al, will show use of the constructs as they pertain to inquiry based learning and Hitchcock et al will address technology integration.

A Model for Evaluating Systems Change: Documenting and Assessing Processes and Impact
Presenter: Dianna L Newman, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract: During this presentation, Dianna Newman will present an overview of an evaluation model for systems change, how it can be implemented, and the major constructs documented by the model. She will show how the model was developed to reflect the major constructs impacted by systems change and how both formative and summative change data can be documented using this process.

Systems Change in Inquiry Based Science Education
Presenters: Dean T Spaulding, State University of New York at Albany
Melaney Towerton, State University of New York at Albany
Robyn Baliber, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract: Spaulding, Towerton and Baliber will present evidence of the model’s utility in documenting long-term change in curriculum and instruction resulting from an innovative program integrating an inquiry-based, student-centered approach in the high school science. Presenters will focus on the use of longitudinal reviews of student products as a means of assessing integration of the program within and across systems.

Systems Change in the Substance Abuse Area
Presenter: Kim Lanaro, State University of New York at Albany

Abstract: Kim Lanaro will present evidence of the model’s successful implementation in documenting systems change in the substance abuse prevention area. The presentation will present the process of developing and clarifying variables reflective of systems change as well as outcomes that could
be assessed on a short-term as well as a long-term basis.

**Systems Change in Technology Supported Curriculum Programs**

**Presenters**
- John H Hitchcock, State University of New York at Albany
- Kevin W Meuwissen, State University of New York at Albany
- Leigh A Mountain, State University of New York at Albany

**Abstract**
This presentation will emphasize the assessment of systems change in programs striving to integrate technology into K-20 educational organizations. Specific settings will include pre-service, in-service, and classroom settings; examples of assessment constructs will include both quantitative and qualitative instrumentation, and the triangulation of findings across multi-site evaluations.

**Systems Change in Developmental Disability Programs**

**Presenter**
- Anna F Lobosco, New York State Developmental Disabilities Planning Council

**Abstract**
This presentation will discuss methods of assessing systems change in programs that serve families and children with developmental disabilities. Topics covered include defining and clarifying the variables that represent systems change, how to determine intermittent as well as long-term outcomes, and how different audiences use the information in policy decision making.

---

**TIG and Committee Sponsored Sessions**

**The Role of Pedagogy in Teaching Evaluation**

**MultiPaper Session 795 to be held in Ballroom B**

**Sponsored by the Teaching of Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Sarita Davis, Clark Atlanta University

**Teaching the Nuances of Systematic Context: Teaching Graduate Students Evaluation Research in a Competency-based Program**

**Presenter**
- Carolyne W Arnold, University of Massachusetts at Boston

**Abstract**
Teaching courses in evaluation research pose a unique and often neglected challenge for academics. Instructors must teach future practitioners and decision makers not only the fundamentals of program evaluation research, but how to translate concepts, evidence and results into clear, understandable doable, usable knowledge suitable for making decisions regarding policy and programs. In addition, instructors must impress upon students the importance of framing evaluations in the systematic context of relevant constituencies, of being flexible when communicating evidence and results. This presentation will describe the pedagogy and instructional activities used in teaching alternative approaches to program evaluation in a competency-based graduate program.

**The Role of the Classroom in Connecting Evaluation Theory to Practice**

**Presenters**
- Elizabeth Whitmore, Carleton University
- Colin Stuart, Carleton University

**Abstract**
Teaching courses in evaluation research pose a unique and often neglected challenge for academics. Instructors must teach future practitioners and decision makers not only the fundamentals of program evaluation research, but how to translate concepts, evidence and results into clear, understandable doable, usable knowledge suitable for making decisions regarding policy and programs. In addition, instructors must impress upon students the importance of framing evaluations in the systematic context of relevant constituencies, of being flexible when communicating evidence and results. This presentation will describe the pedagogy and instructional activities used in teaching alternative approaches to program evaluation in a competency-based graduate program.

**Evaluation Studies Versus Evaluation Systems: Issues and Examples**

**Panel Session 797 to be held in Ballroom D**

**Sponsored by the Theories of Evaluation TIG**

**Chair**
- Nick L Smith, Syracuse University

**Discussant**
- Debra J Rog, Vanderbilt University

**Session Abstract**
Evaluators have historically been more concerned with designing effective evaluation studies, than with the design of evaluation systems. Evaluation studies are conventionally discrete, time-bound investigations suitable for the evaluation of relatively stable evaluands such as products, treatments, and programs. Evaluation systems are intended to provide on-going information suitable for the evaluation of more open-ended evaluands such as service delivery, health monitoring, and policy implementations. The papers in this panel explore the problems of design, implementation, and meta-evaluation of evaluation studies versus systems versus hybrid structures. After an introductory analysis of relevant design distinctions, examples of study
versus systems approaches in national-level health and education evaluations will be discussed. Following that, a taxonomy of study versus system designs in local-level educational evaluations will be presented. The panel discussant will then reflect on the importance of the study versus system distinction to both evaluation theory and practice, encouraging active audience participation.

**Evaluation Studies Versus Systems: Definitions and Dimensions**

Presenter: Nick L Smith, Syracuse University

Abstract: This paper discusses several important conceptual distinctions between evaluation studies and evaluation systems, including defining characteristics, structures and designs, decision rules, and performance criteria. Designing preordinate versus emergent evaluation studies is contrasted with designing fixed versus adaptive evaluation systems. The paper also examines such issues as the difference between a long-term, emergent study and a flexible, responsive evaluation system. Should the meta-evaluation review criteria for an evaluation system differ from that for an evaluation study? What are the characteristics of an effective, adaptive evaluation system? (Utility, information yield, flexibility, cumulative effect, and cost-efficiency are considered.) This paper suggests some distinctions useful in considering the panel presentations that follow.

**Building Evaluations for Emergent Programs, Thinking About Evaluation Systems: Evaluating the Success for All Middle School**

Presenter: Anne M Chamberlain, Success For All Foundation

Abstract: How can internal program evaluators who work with nascent evaluands implement the appropriate evaluation studies or system, while responding to the expectations behind traditional funding requirements? This paper reviews the challenges of evaluating an emergent national middle school reform model. The evaluation work has been informed by emergent evaluation design, and connects to larger research efforts. Learning to recognize system/study distinctions may prove especially important for internal evaluators of emergent programs. We are often privy to elements helpful in forming a system: an understanding of program mechanics and culture, the trust of program staff, access to data, and early decision-making input. Many of us are likely to forge a body of studies with systemic properties. However, unless we fully realize the costs, and can take proper advantage of the benefits particular to these properties, we may be wasting precious evaluation and program resources.

**Project ELI: The Evaluation of Large Initiatives at the National Cancer Institute**

Presenters: William M Trochim, Cornell University, Stephen Marcus, National Cancer Institute, Louise Masse, National Cancer Institute, Ginny Hsieh, National Cancer Institute

Abstract: This presentation describes the Evaluation of Large Initiatives (ELI) project whose purpose is to develop the organizational capability to evaluate large, complex, multidisciplinary, multi-project endeavors like center grants and research networks in a major division within the National Cancer Institute. The project included a broad range of evaluation-related activities including: developing a systems-level model of how evaluation can be integrated into the life cycle of large initiatives; assessing current data collection and information technology capabilities and their relation to evaluation; assessing different mechanisms for supporting and sustaining an ongoing evaluation capability in this type of organization; conducting detailed case studies that illustrate a variety of evaluation activities and how they might be utilized; developing tools and templates that can facilitate transfer of evaluation capacity from one context to another; and, developing an evaluation training and support capability (including a web-based evaluation resource center). A detailed evaluation system example will be provided from work done with the Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Center (TTURC) initiative.

**Local Evaluation Studies and Systems: A Taxonomy of Examples**

Presenters: Nick L Smith, Syracuse University, Hayley M Cavino, Syracuse University

Abstract: This paper reports on the development of a taxonomy that contrasts evaluation study designs with evaluation system designs along four dichotomous criteria: evaluand phenomenon (stable versus dynamic), knowledge claim (value versus cause), knowledge application (local versus generalizable), and design process (preordinate versus emergent). Using the taxonomy, it is possible to classify different types of evaluation, such as client service studies, design experiments, developmental evaluation, and management information control systems. Local-level educational evaluation examples are used to illustrate the utility of the taxonomy in distinguishing among types of evaluation practice.

**Performance Measurement and Reporting in Federal Contexts**

MultiPaper Session 799 to be held in the Washington A room

Sponsored by the Evaluation Use TIG

Chair: Stephanie L Shipman, US General Accounting Office

Dissemination of Evaluation Findings and Recommendations: Emerging Approaches
Evaluation 2002: Saturday, November 9, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm

Presenters
Arlen R. Gullickson, Western Michigan University
Frances Lawrene, University of Minnesota
Nanette M. Keiser, Western Michigan University

Abstract
In this session, we will describe emerging approaches to effectively disseminate evaluation findings and recommendations, based on our evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program. For this program that works to increase the number and quality of technicians in the U.S., disseminating findings and recommendations to over 200 active projects and various stakeholder audiences has been a challenge. Some of the approaches we are presently using include Web postings of various reports, issue-oriented papers, brochures, newsletters, Webinars (Web seminars), interactive data displays, guidebooks, and video/teleconferencing. Advantages and disadvantages of the approaches and a comparison to more traditional ones will be discussed. Effectively matching audiences with formats will also be covered, and a checklist for a feedback workshop will be provided. We will also share implications for costs and completion times when employing these approaches. Issues related to appropriate use of technology for various audiences will also be examined.

Tailoring Culturally-Appropriate Strategies to Build Evaluation Capacity
Presenter: Kathryn E. Newcomer, George Washington University
Abstract: Capturing programmatic performance is on the front burner of virtually all planning and budget offices in federal agencies. Federal agencies are addressing demands for performance measurement and reporting imposed by statutes such as the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the budget submission guidelines imposed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the Executive office of the President. However, instrumental use of the performance data by line managers varies incredibly across federal agencies. The level of interest and resources devoted to institutional learning about programs reflects the organizational culture in governmental units. A variety of factors shape the attitude toward the role of program evaluation within every organization. To build evaluation capacity among line managers, it is essential that change agents understand the organizational culture shaping managers' attitudes and incentives to use program evaluation tools to improve their programs. This paper draws upon the author's experience in tailoring strategies to enhance managers' ability to use evaluation to improve programs in two federal agencies (U.S. HHS and AID).

Evaluation Challenges and Strategies for Select Media Campaigns and Technical Assistance Programs
Presenter: Elaine L. Vaurio, US General Accounting Office
Abstract: Federal agencies are increasingly expected to focus on achieving results and demonstrating how their activities will contribute to achieving agency goals. Agencies have had difficulty in explicating how their programs and activities represent strategies for achieving their performance goals. One type of program disseminates information to inform and persuade individuals to behave in safer, more healthy or productive ways that will promote social, economic and environmental goals. For 5 of these programs, we identified the evaluation challenges they faced and strategies they used to address them. We will describe how agencies sought to compensate for possible bias in self-report surveys, used comparison groups to limit the effects of other programs, and used logic models to logically link activities to intermediate outcomes and to long-term outcomes. This paper will describe different ways to better evaluate information dissemination activities that can help answer accountability and policy questions.

Foresight Studies, Evidence-grounding, and Uncertainty
Presenters: Nancy J. Donovan, US General Accounting Office
Judith A. Droitcour, US General Accounting Office
Theodore Saks, US General Accounting Office
Patrick Mullen, US General Accounting Office

Abstract: Foresight studies are a key evaluation tool that is becoming crucial for providing policymakers with a decision-making framework. Foresight studies outline a range of emerging trends and future possibilities to help governments position themselves to meet challenges long before they reach crisis proportions. Foresight studies perceived as "reliable" are more likely to be accepted and used. This paper discusses (1) the appropriate evidence base for a foresight study and (2) ways of effectively dealing with issues of risk and uncertainty. The evidence base would include the results of program evaluations combined with qualitative trend data (e.g., economic, demographic) as well as qualitative information on new developments in government and technology/utopics that have traditionally been covered in GAO studies. Issues of risk and uncertainty must be addressed when futures methods (such as forecasts) are used to project future outcomes or scenarios; the paper outlines a specific approach to these issues.

Linking Performance to the Budget: Can Agencies Meet the President's Challenge?
Presenter: Stephanie L. Shipman, US General Accounting Office
Abstract: The President has challenged federal agencies to integrate performance data in their budgets to help government achieve better results. Agencies are asked to document their programs' effectiveness, set performance targets for resources requested, and align budget accounts and activities to achieve program targets. So far, all but 3 agencies have failed to do so. Mission complexity, leadership, and the capacity to collect and use performance data have all been identified as barriers to integrating performance and budget data and to depicting how activities and funding will lead to achieving meaningful
results. The nature of some goals and strategies will require complex evaluation studies rather than ongoing performance monitoring systems to adequately assess results. Yet, federal evaluation resources remain limited. Agencies will need ongoing investment, incentives, and support for measuring results, but could also use some clever technical advice from evaluators on addressing challenges to linking resources to results.

Building Capacity for Large-scale Evaluations

MultiPaper Session 800 to be held in the Washington B room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair Sharon A Ramsden, WestEd

Building Evaluation Capacity Among the Law Related Education Field

Presenters Heather J Clawson, Caliber Associates
Kevonne M Small, Caliber Associates

Abstract Since the late 1960s, Law Related Education (LRE) has been implemented in schools and communities across the country to teach youth about law and justice. Although the potential for LRE programs to reduce delinquency and improve civic education is clear to many of us who work in this field, the evidence necessary to "prove" the causal relationship is absent. Caliber Associates is working with the Youth for Justice grantees to develop a LRE evaluation tool kit designed to help local programs demonstrate the effectiveness of their LRE programs. This paper discusses the components of the tool kit, with particular focus on the importance of building evaluation capacity at the state- and local-level.

Evaluation of Local History Projects for Secondary Education in Greece

Presenters Sofia Christopoulo, University of Patras
George Bagakis, University of Patras

Abstract The presentation refers to the ex-post evaluation of 110 local history projects developed by secondary education teachers in collaboration with their students, which took place in the prefecture of Achaia (Greece) during the academic years 1991-1997. The evaluation was based on the Key Evaluation Checklist (KEC) of Michael Scriven. The data were collected from the answers to a questionnaire addressed to each project during its development (focusing on its crucial elements concerning quality) by the teacher in charge of environmental education of the prefecture, as well as from the initial proposals, the final reports and the final products of the projects. The systematic attempt to adjust and use the KEC on the particular type of projects of local history has on the one hand a more general value and on the other hand has provided significant conclusions for important elements of the particular projects evaluated.

Advances in Measurement

MultiPaper Session 801 to be held in the Potomac I room
Sponsored by the Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design TIG
Chair Cynthia R Roberts-Gray, Resource Network

Analysis of Don't Know Responses: Influence on Design and Interpretation of Evaluations Based on an Expert System Called Bridge-it

Presenters Cynthia R Roberts-Gray, Resource Network
Phyllis M Gingiss, University of Houston

Abstract Bridge-It is an expert system that asks 36 questions to assess readiness and estimate likelihood of implementation success for newly adopted school-centered health and education technologies. Because it is brief, content valid, and internally consistent, Bridge-It promises to be a useful tool. But in recent applications to track progress of school health centers (18 schools), tobacco prevention and control initiatives (93 schools), and an alcohol safety curriculum (n=38 schools), half or more of program directors and implementers answered "don't know" to more than 25% of Bridge-It's questions. Items for which "don't know" was indicated included: how important the new program is to the principal, whether there is opposition from parents, and whether staff believe the new program is better than what was being done before. This paper describes the expert system, traces what happened to the evaluation reports, and reviews options for transforming "don't know" into useful feedback.

Assessing Consistency of Intelligence Quotients Across Measurement Tests

Presenters MH Clark, University of Memphis
Randy G Floyd, University of Memphis
William R Shadish, University of Memphis

Abstract Cognitive ability batteries are intended to measure general intelligence using a standardized scale of measurement that can be directly
interpreted regardless of the test used. The present study tests that assumption of score consistency by using methods that examine absolute differences between commonly used ability tests. Generalizability coefficients and within subjects t-tests were used to assess the similarity of general intelligence (g) scores from several nationally standardized and normed test batteries. Pairwise comparisons suggested that similarity of scores between test batteries ranged from very good (G = .96, mean difference = 1.26) to very poor (G = .12, mean difference = 11.31). While these findings are still quite new, they suggest that it may not be reasonable to assume that all ability tests have the same scale of measurement, therefore, the g scores should not be directly interpreted as standardized scores.

**Measuring Cognitive Function: An Empirical Investigation of the Psychometric Properties of a Cognitive Measure**

*Presenters*  
E Lea Witta, University of Central Florida  
Stephen A Sivo, University of Central Florida

*Abstract*  
Herzog and Wallace (1997) discussed a measure designed to assess the cognitive functioning of older adults who participated in the study, formerly known as the Asset and Health Dynamics among the Oldest Old (AHEAD). The measure derives from four well-known tests of cognitive functioning but improves upon them by combining elements from each emphasizing those aspects most relevant to the cognitive changes in the gerontological population. This measure promises to allow researchers to more effectively identify the cognitive change that may lead to dementia. While this measure has been used to assess large numbers of people, it has not been empirically scrutinized as an evaluative tool to assess the internal and external structural validity evidence of the scores produced. To better understand the underlying factor structure of the instrument, longitudinal congeneric, tau-equivalent, and parallel models will be fit using multiple waves of the Health and Retirement study data (previously called AHEAD) obtained from the University of Michigan.

**Evaluating Access to and Integration of Mental Health Issues**

*MultiPaper Session 802 to be held in the Potomac II room*  
*Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG*  
*Chair*  
John A Hermann, ORC Macro

**Evaluation of Adolescent Mental Health Help-seeking Behavior: An Ecological Analysis Using Hierarchical Techniques**

*Presenters*  
Grant W Neeley, University of Cincinnati  
Mark A Carrozza, University of Cincinnati  
Barbara C Perez, Butler Country Mental Health Board  
Valerie Robinson, Recovery Services of Warren and Clinton Counties  
Susan Smith, Clermont County Mental Health & Recovery Board

*Abstract*  
Adolescent help-seeking behavior, and in particular the utilization of professional mental health support systems, can provide an emotional buttress against adolescent feelings of depression, helplessness, stress, and psychosomatic pains. Students from 5th through 12th grades were surveyed. The survey instrument includes a selection of scales or indices designed to measure the following cognitive, social, and psychological determinates of adolescent mental health help-seeking. We also collect data on structural characteristics of individual school building and the entire school district (such as mental health program availability and expenditures, school district fund, and student/teachers ratios). We develop a predictive model of illness behavior and help-seeking in adolescents and school-based health care settings, and develop policy recommendations for reducing the service gap in adolescent mental health service utilization. We also use Hierarchical Linear Modeling techniques to examine the inter-relationship between individual level predictors and structural predictors at the school and school district level.

**When Does a System Change, and When Does it Make a Difference? Disaggregating the Multisite, Multilevel Evaluation of the Access to Community Care and Effective Supports and Services (ACCESS) Program for Homeless Persons with Serious Mental Illness**

*Presenters*  
L Joseph Sonnefeld, NGIT Health Solutions  
Robert G Orwin, Westat  
Fran Randolph, Center for Mental Health Services  
Carolyn Lichtenstein, Northrup Grumman Information Technology Health Solutions  
Mary Anne Myers, Westat  
Kristin Zempolich, NGIT Health Services

*Abstract*  
This presentation will report secondary analyses of data collected in the evaluation of the ACCESS demonstration for homeless persons with serious mental illness, which compared a set of nine sites attempting to improve the integration of their service systems to nine matched sites delivering similar homeless services but not funded to improve systems integration. Analyses of pooled data from all sites detected an overall cross-sectional relationship between measured service-system integration and one individual-level outcome (housing stability), but did not find greater average
improvements in the systems integration of experimental sites or relationships between increased systems integration and client outcomes. Recognizing that pooled analyses can be misleading in the presence of cross-site heterogeneity, the analyses reported in this presentation will employ some of the disciplined exploratory techniques described as ‘principled discovery’ (Mark, 2000) to examine cross-site variation in individual outcomes and in levels of systems integration.

Evaluating Treatment Outcomes for African Americans and Whites Engaged in Treatment at a Community Mental Health Clinic in the Rural South

Presenter: Christopher R. Larrison, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Abstract: Recently, the US Surgeon General (1999, 2001) concluded that ethnicity, diagnosis, socioeconomic status, and gender influence the outcomes of mental health treatment. To evaluate the effect of these factors, data were collected from a sample of individuals (n = 130) seeking treatment at a community mental health clinic. The BASIS-32, a self-report scale measuring psychiatric symptomatology, was used as a proxy for treatment outcomes. It was administered every three months for nine months post-baseline. There was no manipulation of treatment; instead, the natural course of treatment was accepted. The data were analyzed using a hierarchical linear model (HLM) consisting of two models: an individual growth model that represented change in each client’s observed level of symptomatology over time and a between-client model that modeled the possible differences between growth trajectories created by ethnicity, diagnosis, socioeconomic status, and gender. The only significant influence on treatment outcomes was diagnosis.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Interventions from a Major Foundation’s Mental Health Initiative Using a Multicultural Lens

Presenters: Astrid Hendricks-Smith, The California Endowment
Karen Linkins, The Lewin Group

Abstract: This paper presents process evaluation results of an initiative, sponsored by a major healthcare foundation, funding 46 California-based organizations to provide mental health services to traditionally under-served populations. The goals of the evaluation are to define what mental health service effectiveness means within California’s diverse communities and to support the foundation’s strategic efforts to create change within California’s mental health system. Data used include program documents and logs, surveys, and individual and group-interviews. Findings emphasize the influence of contextual and multicultural factors on how effectiveness is conceptualized and defined for each of the 46 organizations and the foundation, more generally. Implications of the differing definitions of effectiveness are discussed in light of: developing appropriate outcome indicators for subsequent phases of the evaluation; and the foundation’s broad goal of achieving mental health system reform.

Juvenile Justice Evaluations

MultiPaper Session 803 to be held in the Potomac III room
Sponsored by the Crime and Justice TIG

Chair: Marcie J. Bober, San Diego State University

Choice: Using Evaluation Processes to Demonstrate Reduced Recidivism Among Probationary Youth

Presenters: Marcie J. Bober, San Diego State University
Audrey Hokoda, San Diego State University

Abstract: The authors, Fellows with San Diego State University’s June Burnette Institute, were tasked with evaluating CHOICE: its core program for youth at risk. Of interest to staff and the two-person research team were changes related to six specific constructs. CHOICE clients were organized into two groups (parents, youth), and surveys were administered to members of each group at two different times. Project staff now have available to them an array of online tools for conducting ongoing, multi-leveled assessment on an online basis. As important, they have a defined framework (Provus’ Discrepancy Model) to guide their efforts. Thus, a thoughtful, systematic design allowed us to depict both short- and long-term program impact. By collecting data at strategic milestone points (near intake, near program completion, post-graduation) and using core demographic variables (preferred language, for example) to classify program participants, we were able to demonstrate the ways in which different service options promote stronger families (parents, youth, siblings), improve academic performance (youth) and more appropriate ways of dealing with family issues (parents and youth), and build a desire to abide by generally accept social norms (youth).

Types of Juvenile Delinquents and Their Relevance to Program Evaluation

Presenter: Philip W. Harris, Temple University

Abstract: Program evaluators in criminal justice have argued that not all delinquents are alike; yet the use of typologies to unmask patterns of outcomes is rare. Taking into account differences in the type of persons that comprise a client population is likely to uncover types of persons that improve, types that get worse and types that remain unchanged. This pattern may hold true for programs that are judged to be effective and those that are judged to be ineffective. This study makes use of a typology of delinquent boys developed empirically for the ProDES system in Philadelphia. With it, nearly 10,000 boys have been classified, based on their responses to fourteen standardized scales. We examine the outcomes of ten residential and ten community programs for
delinquent boys to identify interactions between youth type and program. In the analysis we control for predictors of recidivism as well as program type and dosage.

Using Recidivism Outcome Data to Affect Change in the Connecticut Juvenile Justice System

Presenters: Victoria J Dougherty, Connecticut Policy and Economic Council
Malia Sieve, Connecticut Policy and Economic Council

Abstract: The Connecticut Policy and Economic Council (CPEC) is in the process of conducting a recidivism outcome and cost-benefit analysis of Juvenile Justice Alternative Sanctions Programs in Connecticut at the request of the state legislature. This study will be completed by July 2002.

In 1995, Connecticut implemented a range of services for juvenile delinquents at various risk levels as an alternative to incarceration. This evaluation measures the recidivism outcomes of clients participating in alternative sanction programs by comparing their post-program experiences to juveniles adjudicated as delinquents prior to the 1995 implementation of the programs. The outcomes are tracked from the beginning of intervention through eighteen months after intervention. In addition to analyzing recidivism rates, the severity and types of the crimes are evaluated, as well as how long the juveniles remain crime-free. The final product will include a qualitative assessment of the services provided and an analysis of program cost-effectiveness.

Supporting Diversity Among Evaluation Entrepreneurs: What are the issues?

Think Tank Session 804 to be held in the Potomac IV room
Sponsored by the Minority Issues in Evaluation TIG

Facilitators: Melanie A Hwalek, SPEC Associates
Jane F Morgan, Independent Consultant
Vanessa McKendall, FaceValu Consulting
Juan Martinez, Arizona State Department of Education

Session Abstract: Evaluation entrepreneurs come in all shapes and sizes, but are their needs the same? Do business owners have the same needs for support and technical assistance? Is there anything different about starting and growing a business if you are a person of color? Greater opportunities? Bigger barriers? To what extent does ethnicity influence business owner experiences when engaging evaluation contracts? What are lessons learned for business owners working in cross cultural settings? This think tank will explore these issues with the goal of making recommendations for what AEA and its relevant TIGS can do to support evaluation entrepreneurs of different ethnicities working in cross-cultural settings.

Exploring Relationships in Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluations: A Learning Organizations Focus

MultiPaper Session 805 to be held in the Potomac V room
Sponsored by the Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation TIG

Chairs: Imelda R Castaneda, University of Cincinnati


Presenters: Sarah E Heinemeier, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Anne D’Agostino, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Abstract: Evaluation, Assessment, and Policy Connections (EvAP) and the Forsyth County Early Childhood Partnership (FECP) have a seven history of collaborative evaluation. EvAP has worked as external evaluators for FECP since the inception of Forsyth’s programming. In that time, many changes in Forsyth’s programming and organizational structure have occurred, due in part to evaluation evidence. The long-term collaborative nature of this evaluation makes it both unique and an opportunity to demonstrate how evaluation can be used to inform systems change. This presentation will draw on specific evaluation plans and reports, as well as organizational strategic planning to create a model for systems change for county-level social services agencies.

Building a Learning Organization: A Systems Approach

Presenters: Neva Nahan, Wayne State University
Debbie Baker, Covenant House Michigan

Abstract: The paper explores the development of an evaluation system in an agency that had not previously conducted evaluation. The authors represent both the perspective of an evaluator and a practitioner. The two began working together to design an evaluation system. Their goal was to transform the agency into a true learning organization. The paper describes their partnership in designing evaluation systems for Covenant House Michigan.
The process of engaging staff is explored, along with how the systems were introduced in phases at agency sites. Through this process, the learning aspects of the organization are tracked and documented. The paper ends with lessons learned through this process, and plans for the future.

**The Dance of an Evaluation Partnership**

**Presenters**
- Mary L Marx, University of Cincinnati
- Debbie Zorn, University of Cincinnati
- Dennis J Sykes, The Ohio State University

**Abstract**
Results of a meta-evaluative self-study to understand effects of a five-year evaluation partnership are reported here. This case study looks at the partnership between a Midwestern Head Start/Early Head Start (HS/EHS) training and technical assistance (T/TA) provider and an evaluation center, both situated in university settings. While evaluating T/TA systems affecting services to HS/EHS programs, the partnership evolved into a symbiotic relationship contributing to the development of both organizations' capacity to affect systemic change throughout the regional Head Start system and beyond. Shifting evaluator roles meeting shifting evaluation needs set the context for an evaluation dance, each partner alternating between leading and following. The study utilized structured group discussions to systematically focus on partnership effects related to intentional, systemic, and transformational learning of these organizations, positioning both for future success. Study findings will be of interest to those using or considering this type of collaborative, reflective, and dialogic model.

**Culturally Centered Evaluation and Practice**

**MultiPaper Session 806 to be held in the Potomac VI room**

**Culturally Centered Treatment for African-American Boys**

**Presenter**
Gregory Washington, Clark Atlanta University

**Abstract**
This paper presents program evaluation results from a culturally centered treatment method that is sensitive to the unhealthy predisposing factors that have influenced the disparity in young African-American male incarceration rates. The paper presentation addresses need for the social work profession to provide service providers with prevention and treatment programs that are designed to address the challenges of specific vulnerable populations. There is an analysis of the rate of young African-American male incarceration and why it has led some to believe that it represents a condition that is a social problem of epidemic proportions (Hill, 2000; Schiele, 2000 and Wilson, 1996).

**Standards for Cultural Competence in Social Work Practice: Implications for Evaluation**

**Presenter**
Karen E Kirkhart, Syracuse University

**Abstract**
As AEA seeks to improve the capacity of evaluators to work across cultures, it can draw upon the knowledge and resources of its member disciplines and professions. Social work is a prime example. In June 2001, the National Association of Social Workers’ Board of Directors approved the NASW Standards for Cultural Competence in Social Work Practice http://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/standards/cultural.htm Though practice is understood to be inclusive of evaluation (all accredited social work programs are required to prepare social workers to evaluate their own practice), implications for evaluation are not spelled out in the Standards. Taking the NASW Standards as a point of reference, this paper examines the rationale, assumptions, and theoretical foundations behind them, translating these general guidelines into evaluation applications. This paper enumerates principles of culturally competent evaluation, viewed from a social work perspective and reflects on the strengths and limitations of the NASW Standards, viewed from an evaluation perspective.

**Evaluating Practice to Meet the Needs of Ethnic Minorities: Repeated Surveys of Staff and Residents in Hostels for Offenders**

**Presenters**
- Mansoor AF Kazi, University of Huddersfield
- Shahida Kazi, University of Huddersfield
- Imogen Brown, West Yorkshire Probation Board
- Treena May, University of Huddersfield

**Abstract**
The paper reports on an evaluation of an initiative to improve practice to meet the needs of diverse ethnic groups in all six hostels for offenders in West Yorkshire, England. The residents included people on remand awaiting trial and others on post-custody licence. The survey instrument for residents was found to have good internal consistency, with alphas ranging from .79 to .84, and the response rates ranged from 91-93%. Inferential statistics were used in the data analysis, enabling comparisons between the surveys. The findings from all three surveys indicate very high levels of satisfaction amongst residents in all six hostels. However, there were signs that more work needed to be done, particularly with regard to a growing minority amongst all ethnic groups that were dissatisfied. The staff surveys indicated a growing awareness of the issues of culture and equal opportunities; however, there was a small minority opposed to the initiative.
Responding to Sponsors and Stakeholders
Panel Session 807 to be held in the Conference Theater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Chair Rakesh Mohan, Washington State Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee
Presenters David J Bernstein, Montgomery County Public Schools
Maria D Whitsett, Austin Independent School District
Rakesh Mohan, Washington State Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee
Session Abstract This is an interactive panel that focuses on the importance of understanding and responding to the authorizing environment of state and local government evaluation. The panel members are some of the authors of the upcoming New Directions volume titled "State and Local Government Evaluation: Responding to Sponsors and Stakeholders." The session will allow the audience members to engage in a dialogue with the volume's authors regarding their "real life" experiences in conducting evaluations and responding to sponsors and stakeholders at state and local government levels. The entire session will be devoted to questions and answers.

Thorny Issues for Agencies Seeking to Improve the Impact Evaluation of Their Programs
Think Tank Session 808 to be held in the Tidewater room
Sponsored by the State and Local Government TIG
Facilitators Patricia J Rogers, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
Bron M McDonald, Department of Natural Resources & Environment
Session abstract There are considerable technical and organisational challenges in improving impact evaluations. Traditional experimental or quasi-experimental designs are not always possible or suitable - and there are other issues besides causal attribution. Agencies' requirements for regular but small-scale evaluation of the impact of their programs pose special challenges. The techniques of large impact evaluations are often not feasible. This session will focus on challenges associated with (1) IDENTIFYING impacts of interest to stakeholders (2) DESCRIBING these impacts (3) ATTRIBUTING these to the program and (4) REPORTING these impacts in ways that facilitate use. Participants will join a small group focusing on one of these areas to identify the challenges and how these might be addressed - both in terms of evaluation techniques and organisational processes, such as ways of meeting differing evaluation expectations and needs of different stakeholders and strategies for scaling up successful evaluation techniques and frameworks across other programs.

Evaluation and Non-profits: Institutional, Organizational and Historic Contexts
MultiPaper Session 809 to be held in the Kennedy room
Sponsored by the Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation TIG
Chair R Sam Larson, Applied Research
A Theory Based Study of Program Evaluation Use and Practice Among Nonprofit Organizations in New York State
Presenter Joanne G Carman, State University of New York at Albany
Abstract This paper makes a formal link between field of evaluation and the study of organizational behavior and theory. Specifically, this paper uses five organizational theories to examine program evaluation use and practice among nonprofit organizations providing human services. The focus of this research is nonprofit organizations in New York State that provide human services in the fields of community development, developmental disabilities, and social services. Using data gathered through personal interviews with a purposive sample of 30 nonprofit organizations and 10 funding organizations, this paper describes the extent to which these nonprofit organizations are engaging in various program evaluation activities. The paper uses five organizational theories (rational choice, strategic management, agency theory, resource dependence theory and institutional theory) to explain why these nonprofit organizations engage in these evaluation activities and how they use the evaluation results. The paper's findings are not only descriptive; they are explanatory and predictive as well.

Does Institutional Context Matter? How performance Measurement is Shaping Practice in the Nonprofit Community Development Field
Presenter Lehn M Benjamin, Cornell University
Abstract In the last ten years, accountability and effectiveness have become central concerns in the nonprofit sector (Light 2000; Salamon 1997; Walker and Grossman 1999). While these concerns are not necessarily new for nonprofits (Flitzgibbon 1997, Hall 1992), effectiveness and accountability...
have increased in importance for several reasons, including: visible scandals in the early 1990s, growing competition with for-profit service providers, increased commercialization, and the use of nonprofits to fulfill functions previously performed by the state (Uphoff 1994). In response, funders both public and private are turning to evaluation, specifically outcome measurement, to ensure accountability and effectiveness. This paper presents the results qualitative interviews with national and regional funders that support community development as well as interviews with community development practitioners. These interviews are part of a larger study that examines how the increasing emphasis on performance, specifically the use of outcomes, is shaping practice in the community development field.

Evaluation of International Health Programs

MultiPaper Session 810 to be held in the Jefferson room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG
Chair Kate Spring, Independent Consultant

Malaria Control Reforms: Lessons Learned from Participatory Malaria Control Strategies in the Philippines
Presenters Fernand A de los Reyes, University of Tokyo
Abstract Malaria’s global burden to over 300 million people according to the Roll Back Malaria initiative cannot be ignored. Aside from HIV/AIDS and TB, malaria reportedly kills one child every 40 seconds. Given this urgency, an independent evaluation of the Malaria Control Program of the Integrated Development Project in the Philippines seeks to present the lessons learned from the successful 82 percent reduction of malaria incidence. Qualitative and quantitative methods such as cost-benefit analysis have been combined in this study to assess the impact of participatory malaria control strategies in the Province of Palawan in the Philippines. Local resource mobilization strategies for malaria control are likewise presented to serve as guide for development programs on a similar developing-country setting.

Applying Program Evaluation Standards in Evaluating Rehabilitation Programs in International Contexts
Presenters Etoile LeBlanc, Independent Consultant
Madhabi Chatterji, Columbia University
Abstract The purpose of this paper will be to use the case study approach to examine applicability of the Program Evaluation Standards published by The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994) to examine evaluations conducted in international, community-based rehabilitation programs. Five international studies conducted in Afghanistan, Lebanon, India, Nepal, and Kenya will be used as cases to examine the extent to which the guidelines generalize in fields outside education, particularly in developing countries.

Evaluation of the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Central America Safe Drinking Water Initiative
Presenter Eric L Marsh, US Environmental Protection Agency
Abstract This paper presents findings from a report that examines the effectiveness of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-directed efforts to improve drinking water programs in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras in order to reduce the number of child deaths from waterborne diseases. Through cooperation with the Pan-American Health Organization and Central American water utilities, health ministries, and universities, and funding made available by the U.S. Agency for International Development as part of the U.S. relief efforts responding to Hurricane Mitch, the EPA, in conjunction with its partners, developed a water quality improvement program consisting of four components: (1) laboratory capacity building, (2) source water protection, (3) water treatment plant optimization, and (4) safe drinking water program development. The evaluation report examines the outcomes of each of the program components, suggests the potential for program sustainability, and describes the potential to replicate the program in other countries and regions.

Methodological Issues in Studying Child and Adolescent Behavioral Health Services
Panel Session 811 to be held in the Lincoln room
Sponsored by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health TIG
Chair Craig Anne Heflinger, Vanderbilt University
Session Abstract As policy makers, funding sources, advocates, evaluators, and insurance companies become more interested in monitoring and evaluating behavioral health services, the field needs to be discussing issues related to measuring substance abuse service access and use. This panel will present three different approaches to studying child and adolescent behavioral health services.

Validity of Four Approaches to Measuring Substance Abuse Treatment Services
Presenter Dennis D Deck, RMC Research Corporation
Abstract: This validity study compares four measures of substance abuse treatment utilization: self-report, chart review, administrative databases, and Medicaid encounter data. Comparable indicators of service utilization were calculated across data sources for prospective samples of 488 adults (ages 18-64) and 301 adolescents (ages 12-17) presenting for publicly funded substance abuse outpatient treatment in Oregon and Washington. Kappa coefficients varied widely depending on the utilization indicator and the data sources compared. As expected, there was fairly high agreement between three of the sources that clients participated in an episode of substance abuse treatment. There was high agreement among sources about utilization of certain service categories (e.g., methadone maintenance services). Overall, however, the kappa coefficients were extremely low for some comparisons. Encounter data appeared to dramatically under represent the use of covered treatment services, even though the analysis was restricted to individuals for whom chart review confirmed that Medicaid was the primary payer.

Using Geographic Information Systems to Assess Child and Adolescent Access to Behavioral Health Services

Presenter: Robert Saunders, Vanderbilt University

Abstract: This paper presents information on the spatial relationship between behavioral health service providers and need for behavioral health services among Medicaid enrollees. This analysis presents information on the accessibility of services for Medicaid-eligible youth with serious emotional disorders (SED) in Tennessee. Our analysis considers the spatial distribution and concentration of behavioral health service providers for the Medicaid population and contrasts the distribution of providers with that of youth with SED. Provider data come from the Tennessee behavioral health organizations' (BHO) file of network providers. Using ArcInfo GIS software, we are able to map concentration levels by zip code and aggregate to the county level. Because provider participation is recorded over time, we will be able to display the changes in provider coverage areas during the maturation of the TennCare Partners program. Data on the behavioral health service needs of Medicaid-eligible youth with SED come interview information on functioning and symptoms for youth (Child Behavior Checklist, Columbia Impairment Scale), which have been combined into a rating of SED. Using post-stratified sampling weights, we estimate population rates of SED from the survey responses and map the estimated concentration levels of SED based on county of residence during the baseline interview.

The Publicly-funded Treatment System for Adolescents with Substance Abuse Problems: Integrating Data from Multiple Sources

Presenters: Craig Anne Helfinger, Vanderbilt University
Ana Maria Branan, Vanderbilt University

Abstract: In order to determine the amount of publicly-funded substance abuse treatment and the extent to which different public funding streams pay for adolescent substance abuse treatment, this study integrated administrative claim/encounter data bases from three state agencies to determine number of youth served, types of services provided, payer sources. Although estimates of drug or alcohol dependency are over 5% for adolescents, only 1,200 youth statewide received any substance abuse service during recent 3-month periods. Less than 1% of TennCare eligible youth received a substance abuse service. Less than 1/10 of TennCare youth who received any behavioral health service received a substance abuse service paid by TennCare. The Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant paid for the most days of publicly-funded service, and funded many days of service for TennCare youth. Youth in state custody used a disproportionately high number of TennCare and Block Grant services compared to other adolescents, despite a separate funding stream for their treatment.

Evaluation and Reform in Developing Countries

Panel Session 812 to be held in the Roosevelt room
Sponsored by the International and Cross-cultural Evaluation TIG

Chair: Victoria M Elliott, The World Bank

Session Abstract: The international development community is deeply involved in issues of reform, both of the development system and of developing countries themselves. This panel presents some of the major findings of three evaluation studies undertaken by the Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank. These evaluations, while certainly concerned with the World Bank, explore issues relevant to the whole development enterprise. All of them are deeply involved in the issues of reform, in terms of both evaluating reform initiatives and showing how evaluation can contribute to the reform effort.

Evaluation of the International Development Association

Presenter: Catherine Gwin, The World Bank

Abstract: The International Development Association (IDA) is a unique instrument of development cooperation, focused on assisting the world's poorest countries. During the seven-year period covered by this review (FY94 - 00), IDA committed just over $42 billion to some 77 low-income borrower countries to support country efforts to accelerate sustainable economic growth and poverty reduction. OED evaluates development interventions by assessing how their results stack up against their own stated objectives. This review concentrated on IDA's compliance with replenishment undertakings and development contributions in six thematic development priorities (poverty reduction, social sector development, private sector development, governance,
environmentally sustainable development, and gender), and four priority process reform objectives. To address these issues, OED’s review used a multifaceted evaluation design, incorporating a number of approaches.

The Comprehensive Development Framework: An Evaluation
Presenter: John Eriksson, The World Bank

The CDF evaluation examined the experiences of five CDF pilot and one non-pilot countries in implementing the four CDF principles: long-term holistic development framework; country ownership; country-led partnerships; and results orientation. In particular, the evaluation assessed the extent to which implementation affected intermediate development outcomes, including the relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of the overall development assistance system, both on the ground and at the policy level in six countries. The CDF evaluation was itself conducted in accordance with and demonstrates—the CDF principles of participation and partnership. The evaluation was a multi-stakeholder effort governed by a 30-member Steering Committee, including nine bilateral members. The country case studies were planned and designed in consultation with various partners and stakeholders active in the countries.

Evaluating the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative
Presenter: Madhur Gautam, The World Bank

Abstract The HIPC initiative was proposed by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and agreed by governments around the world in the fall of 1996. It was the first comprehensive approach to reduce the external debt of the world’s poorest, most heavily indebted countries, and represented an important step forward in placing debt relief within an overall framework of poverty reduction. While the Initiative yielded significant early progress, multilateral organizations, bilateral creditors, HIPC governments, and civil society have engaged in an intensive dialogue since the inception of the Initiative about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. A major review in 1999 resulted in a significant enhancement of the original framework, and has produced a HIPC Initiative that is “deeper, broader and faster”. OED’s evaluation assesses the effectiveness of the initiative and attempts to find out what has and has not worked since the inception of the initiative in 1996.

Systemic Change in Schools: Evaluation of Federally-funded Comprehensive School Reform
MultiPaper Session 813 to be held in the Arlington room
Sponsored by the Pre-K - 12 Educational Evaluation TIG
Chair: Michelle LaPointe, US Department of Education

Multi-level, Multi-evaluation Design for the Comprehensive School Reform Program
Presenter: Michelle LaPointe, US Department of Education

Abstract The U.S. Department of Education has initiated multiple evaluation projects aimed at measuring the success of the Comprehensive School Reform Program (which has provided thousands of schools with three-year awards averaging about $70,000 per year). This paper will report on the overall design and approach to these multi-level efforts, including studies of early implementation, large scale national surveys of principals and teachers, and case studies of individual schools. The presenter will report on how these multiple evaluations are providing a full picture of the impact of the program, as well as how the early studies have shaped later evaluation efforts.

Lessons Learned from Case Studies of 18 Schools Implementing Comprehensive School Reform
Presenters: Robert K Yin, COSMOS Corporation; Michelle LaPointe, US Department of Education; Dawn Kim, COSMOS Corporation

Evaluating the Comprehensive School Reform Program
Presenters: Naida Tushnet, WestEd; Robert K Yin, COSMOS Corporation; John F Flaherty Jr, WestEd; Andrew Smith, WestEd

Developing Systemic Capacity for Scientific Prevention: Evolving Structures and Tools
MultiPaper Session 814 to be held in the Fairfax room
Sponsored by the Health Evaluation TIG
Chair: John F Stevenson, University of Rhode Island

The Evolution of an Evaluation Capacity-building System for Substance Abuse Prevention

Evaluation 2002: Saturday, November 9, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm
Presenters: John F. Stevenson, University of Rhode Island, Paul Florin, University of Rhode Island

Abstract: A team of evaluators in Rhode Island has embedded the role of evaluation in a larger context of planning and delivering substance abuse prevention interventions. This paper reports on the steps in the evolution from single-agency/coalition capacity-building for evaluation to statewide intervention in support of scientific prevention. The evaluation perspective emphasizes needs/resources assessment, plausible logic for well-defined effects, careful program selection and implementation, and evaluation linked systemically to intervention refinement. In Rhode Island that perspective has become embedded at both the local organizational level and the statewide level for substance abuse prevention, entailing reform within the state agency responsible for funding substance abuse prevention. The current structure includes a re-tooled RFP, capacity assessment to guide training and technical assistance, training for both state agency staff and local prevention personnel, a generic logic model linked to state-level outcome objectives, and a state-level evaluation well connected to the local level through these links.
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**Reflections on Evaluation as a Systemic Process that Reforms Systems**
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Bowcock, Dianne [357] University of Wisconsin - Madison; The Learning Through Evaluation, Adaptation and Dissemination Center; 1900 University Ave; Madison WI 53706 USA
Bowden, Virginia M [564] University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Brisco Library; 7703 Floyd Curl Dr; San Antonio TX 78284-7940 USA; bowden@uthscsa.edu
Bowen, Kathryn [425] BECS Inc; The Enterprise Center; 703 S Elmer Ave; Sayre PA 18840 USA; kathryn.bowen@cyber-quest.com
Bowen, Linda [362] 1522 K St Ste 550; Washington DC 20005 USA; lbowen@nfcvp.com
Bowering, David [581] DJ Bowering Associates Inc; 484 Carlyle Ct; Crofton MD 21114 USA; dbowering@msn.com
Boyd, Jimmy L [316] Post Office Box 7833; Jackson MI 39284 USA; JimLB4chem@aol.com
Boyd, Teresa [326] University of Connecticut; Neag School of Education; 2131 Hillside Rd Unit 3224; Storrs CT 06269 USA; teresa@acceleratedschools.net
Boyle, Stacey L [792] NETg; 1751 W Diehl Rd Ste 200; Naperville IL 60563 USA; mboyle2@juno.com
Bozeman, Barry [327] Georgia Institute of Technology; School of Public Policy; 312DM Smith Bldg; Atlanta GA 30332 USA
Bracey, Gerald [503] 1797 Duffield Ln; Alexandria VA 22307 USA; gbracey@erols.com
Bradley, Robert H [334] University of Arkansas Little Rock; 2801 S University Ave; Little Rock AR 72204 USA
Bradley-Bull, Kristin [386] University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Center for the Study of Social Issues; 915 Northridge St
Becher-Weaver Bldg - PO Box 26170; Jackson MI 39284 USA; JimLB4chem@aol.com
Boyce, Tom [433] University of West Florida; Office of Juvenile Studies; 1100 University Pkwy; Pensacola FL 32514-5705 USA; tbrame@uwf.edu
Branan, Ana Maria [811] 2529 Lauderdale Dr; Atlanta GA 30345 USA; ana.m.branan@vanderbilt.edu
Campbell, Jean C [709] Missouri Institute of Mental Health; Program in Consumer Studies and Training; 5400 Arsenal St; St Louis MO 63139 USA; campbelljm@mimh.edu
Campbell, Jennifer W [558] Albert Einstein Healthcare Network; 117 Merion Ave; Narberth PA 19072-2414 USA; jwcampbe@brynmawr.edu
Campbell, Kimberly [603] REDA International Inc; 11141 Georgia Ave Ste 517; Wheaton MD 20902 USA; campbell@reda-intl.com
Campbell, Martha [405] The James Irvine Foundation; One Market Steuart Tower Ste 2500; San Francisco CA 94105 USA; mscampbell@irvine.org
Campt, David [105] 5904 Cleveland Ave; Riverdale MD 20737 USA; racedoctor@visto.com
Canfield, Annette [340] Center for Healthy Communities; 140 East Monument Ave; Dayton OH 45402 USA; Annette.Canfield@wright.edu
Cao, Feng [602] Southern Illinois University; Dept of Psychology; Life Science II Rm 281; Carbondale IL 62901-6502 USA; fengcao@siu.edu
Capela, Stanley J [390  581  733] Heartshare Human Services; 191 Joralemon St; Brooklyn NY 11201 USA; stanley.capela@heartshare.org
Caracelli, Valerie J [304  352] US General Accounting Office; Center for Evaluation Methods & Issues ARM Rm 2440F; 441 G St NW; Washington DC 20548 USA; CaracelliV@gao.gov
Carazo-Clayson, Zoe [105] 440 27th St; San Francisco CA 94101 USA; zoeclay@sfu.edu
Carey, Martha Ann [430  572  742] National Institute of Mental Health; Services Review Committee; 6001 Executive Blvd Rm 6151 MSC 9609; Rockville MD 20892-9609 USA; mcarey@mail.nih.gov
Carman, Joanne G [782  809] 441 Hamilton St; Albany NY 12203 USA; carmanj@albany.net
Carrozza, Mark A [802] University of Cincinnati; Institute for Policy Research; PO Box 210132; Cincinnati OH 45221-5077 USA; Mark.Carrozza@uc.edu
Carta, Judy J [394] University of Kansas; Juniper Gardens Children's Project; 650 Minnesota 2nd Fl; Kansas City KS 66101 USA; cartajukuh.cc.ukans.edu
Carland, Jennifer [433] Children's Memorial Institute for Education and Research; Child Health Data Lab; 2300 Children's Plaza No 157; Chicago IL 60614 USA; jcarland@childrensmemorial.org
Carvalho, Soniya [430] The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-307; Washington DC 20433 USA; scarvalho@worldbank.org
Caspi, Opher [584] University of Arizona; EGAD - Dept of Psychology; Tucson AZ 85721 USA; ocaspi@ahsc.arizona.edu
Cassaro,Denise A [385  421  616] Cornell University; Community Development; 1501 Dickson Hall; Ithaca NY 14853 USA; Dac11@cornell.edu
Castaneda, Imelda R [407  805] University of Cincinnati; Evaluation Services Center; Edwards One Rm 2150 A Cory Blvd; Cincinnati OH 45221-0105 USA; Imelda.Castaneda@uc.edu
Castile, Mary Ann [533] Castle Consulting; 290 West 236 St; Bronx NY 10463 USA; mac615@aol.com
Catapano, Nicole [393  407  718] State University of New York at Albany; Indian Quad B-7; 1400 Washington Ave; Albany NY 12222 USA; ncatapano@uamail.albany.edu
Catsambas, Tessie T [728] EnCompass LLC; 7803 Fox Gate Court; Bethesda MD 20817 USA; tcatsambas@encompassworld.com
Chamberlain, Anne M [369  418  797] Success For All Foundation; 200 W Towsontown Blvd; Baltimore MD 21204 USA; rempert@msn.com
Chambliss, Julie W [399  570  748] Chambliss & Associates Inc; 1031 Muirfield Dr; Marietta GA 30068 USA; chamj@bellsouth.net
Chan, Kwai [329] US Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Inspector General; 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW #2410; Washington DC 20460 USA; chan.kwai@epa.gov
Chavolla, Kate [340] Center for Healthy Communities; 140 East Monument Ave; Dayton OH 45402 USA; Katherine.Cauley@wright.edu
Chavolla, Hayley M [365  715  797] Syracuse University School of Education; Office of Professional Development; 251 Huntington Hall; Syracuse NY 13244 USA; hcano214@syr.edu
Celebucki, Carolyn [814] University of Rhode Island Providence Campus; Community Research and Services Team; 80 Washington St Rd 423; Providence RI 02903 USA; cceleb@etal.uri.edu
Cerna, Oscar [309] WestEd; 4665 Lampson Ave; Los Alamitos CA 90720 USA; ocerna@wested.org
Chamberlain, Anne M [369  418  797] Success For All Foundation; 200 W Towsontown Blvd; Baltimore MD 21204 USA; rempert@msn.com
Chavez, David M [604  711] Association for the Study and Development of Community; 312 S Frederick Ave; Gaithersburg MD 20877 USA; dchavis@capablecommunity.com
Chawla, Louise [736] 416 Logan St; Frankfort KY 40601 USA; chawla393@aol.com
Chaytor, Kaireen [375] Dalhousie University; School of Public Administration; Faculty of Management Studies; Halifax NS B3H 3J5 CANADA; kaireen.chaytor@hfx.aast.ca
Cook, Melonya K [433] United Way of the Greater Dayton Area; 184 Salem Ave; Dayton OH 45406 USA; melyonac@dayton-unitedway.org
Cooksey, Leslie J [340] University of Delaware College of Human Services and Public Policy; Center for Community Research and Service; 297 Graham Hall; Newark DE 19716-7500 USA; ljcooksey@udel.edu
Cooper, Bruce [721] Poudre Health Services District; 120 Bristlecone Dr; Fort Collins CO 80524 USA; bcooper@healthdistrict.org
Cooper, Harris [614] University of Missouri; Dept of Psychological Sciences; McAlester Hall; Columbia MO 65211 USA; cooperh@missouri.edu
Corbiere, Marc [402] Douglas Hospital Research Centre; 6875 LaSalle Blvd; Verdun QC H4H 1R3 CANADA; mcormar@douglas.mcgill.ca
Cordes, Joseph [624] The George Washington University; George Washington Institute for Public Policy; Washington DC 20052 USA; cordes@gwu.edu
Corey, Debbie [320] University of Texas at El Paso; Partnership for Technology in Education; Education Bldg Rm 810; El Paso TX 79968 USA
Couchonnal, Graciela [760] 5708 W 128th Terr; Overland Park KS 66209 USA; gcouchonnal@hotmail.com
Coulter, Colleen L [514] 121 Meadow Dr; Beaver Falls PA 15010 USA; ccoulter1@earthlink.net
Coulton, Claudia [316] Case Western Reserve University; Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences; Center for Urban Poverty & Social Change; 11235 Bellflower Rd; Cleveland OH 44106-7164 USA; cc10@po.cwu.edu
Council, Carol [433] RTI International; PO Box 12194; Research Triangle Park NC 27706 USA; ccouncil@rti.org
Counts, J Slake [337] Children's Board of Hillsborough County; 1205 E 8th Ave; Tampa FL 33605 USA; jcounts@childrensboard.org
Coulson, J Bradley [378 754] University of Ottawa; 145 Jean Jacques Lussier; Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 CANADA; bcoulson@uottawa.ca
Cousins, Thomas D [514] E Centre; 46 Hof St; Gardens; Cape Town 8001 SOUTH AFRICA; thomcous@hotmail.com
Covington, Benjamin G [322] 700 Quarterstaff Rd; Winston-Salem NC 27104 USA; bgcoving@uncg.edu
Cowley, Kimberly S [731] Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc; PO Box 1348; Charleston WV 25325 USA; cowleyk@aol.org
Cox, Gary [420] 6010 32nd Ave NE; Seattle WA 98115 USA; gcox@u.washington.edu
Coyne-Cassata, Jennifer [407 595] Fairfax County Public Schools; Office of Program Evaluation; 7423 Camp Alger Ave; Falls Church VA 22042 USA; jccassata@fcps.edu
Crowley, Melinda L [737] US Census Bureau; Center for Survey Methods Research; Washington DC 20233 USA; melinda.crowley@census.gov
Cruce, Ashley P [740] 3928-A Shenandoah Ave; St. Louis MO 63110 USA; acruce@hotmail.com
Culp, Katherine McMillan [364 749] Education Development Center; Center for Children and Technology; 96 Morton St 7th Fl; New York NY 10014 USA; kculp@edc.org

D'Agostino, Anne [313 608 805] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Education; Evaluation Assessment and Policy Connections; CB 2901; Chapel Hill NC 27599 USA; anned@unc.edu
Dahler-Larsen, Peter [569] Dept of Political Science and Public Management; University of Southern Denmark; Campusvej 55; Odense M 5230 DENMARK; PDL@sam.sdu.dk
Daly, Michael [336] Dept for Work and Pensions; Level 2 Rockingham House; 123 West St; Sheffield S1 4ER UNITED KINGDOM; mike.daly@jobcentreplus.gov.uk
Danter, Elizabeth H [621] The Ohio State University; 315 Ramseyer Hall; 29 W Woodruff Ave; Columbus OH 43210-1177 USA; danter.5@osu.edu
Darabi, Abbas [433] Florida State University; Center for Performance Technology; 4623 -C University Center; Tallahassee FL 32306-2540 USA; adarabi@cpt.fsu.edu
Dasanayake, Ananda [721] New York University; College of Dentistry, Dept of Epidemiology and Health Promotion; 345 E 24th St; New York NY 10010 USA; ad75@nyu.edu
Davey, Melissa A [316] 1620 McElderry St #11-B-1; Baltimore MD 21205 USA; mdavey@jhsp.edu
Davidson, E Jane [109 301 629 752] Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008-5237 USA; Jane.Davidson@wmich.edu
Davies, Ian [376] University of Victoria; Capacity Development Network; Victoria BC CANADA; idavies@capacity.ca
Davies, Scott [521 610] American Institutes for Research; 1000 Thomas Jefferson St NW Ste 300; Washington DC 20007-3835 USA; SDavies@air.org
Durand, Marie-Josée [433] University of Montreal; Interdisciplinary Health Research Group; PO Box 6128 Succ Centre-ville; Montreal QC H3C 3J7 CANADA
Durand, Maryann [102  399  581] 690 S Fadia St; Maple Park IL 60151 USA; mdurdland@aol.com
Dutton, Mary Ann [733] Georgetown University Medical Center; Dept of Psychiatry; 620 Kober Cogan Hall; Washington DC 20007 USA; mad27@georgetown.edu
Duttweiler, Michael [705] Cornell University; Cornell Cooperative Extension; 383 Roberts Hall; Ithaca NY 14853 USA; mwd1@cornell.edu
Dye, Melanie [404] University of South Carolina; Dept of Psychology; Columbus SC 29208 USA; melaniem@usa.net

Earl, Lorna [407] University of Toronto - TPS; OISE; 252 Bloor St West; Toronto ON M5S 1V6 CANADA; learl@oise.utoronto.ca
Eastern, Douglas V [386  559] University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Center for the Study of Social Issues 41 McNeutt Bldg; PO Box 26170; Greensboro NC 27402-6170 USA; doug.easterling@uncg.edu
Eastmond, Nick [395] Utah State University; Dept of Instructional Technology; Logan UT 84322-2830 USA; neast@cc.usu.edu
Eckert, William [626] The World Bank; 1818 H St NW MS J4-403; Washington DC 20433 USA; weckert@worldbank.org
Edwards, Arlene [433  599] 4850 Connecticut Ave Apt 311; Washington DC 20008 USA; macomehs@aol.com
Elbert, Chanda D [773] 2116 TAMU; 223 Scoates Hall; College Station TX 77843-2116 USA; CEElbert@tamu.edu
Elliott, Victoria M [812] The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-303; Washington DC 20433 USA; veliott@worldbank.org
Ellis, Bruce [334] Battelle Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation; 2101 Wilson Blvd Ste 800; Arlington VA 22201 USA; ellis@battelle.org
Emshoff, James G [398] Georgia State University; Dept of Psychology; 3 University Plaza; Atlanta GA 30303 USA; jemshoff@gsu.edu
Endres, Cheryl [422  716  741] 1944 Valentine NE; Grand Rapids MI 49525 USA; cendres@grcc.cc.mi.us
Enger, John [776] Barry University; ADSOE; 11300 NE 2 Ave; Miami Shores Fl 33161 USA; jenger@mail.barry.edu
Engle, Molly [100  101  118  372  375  500  566  572  798  816] Oregon State University; 307 Ballard Hall; Corvallis OR 97331 USA; molly.engle@oregonstate.edu
Eoyang, Glenda H [374  590  714] Chaos Limited Inc; 50 E Golden Lake Rd; Circle Pines MN 55014 USA; eoyang@chaos-limited.com
Eriksson, John [812] The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-303; Washington DC 20433 USA; jeriksson@worldbank.org
Erlanger, Wendy [760] California Lutheran University; 60 W Olsen Rd; Thousand Oaks CA 91360-2787 USA; erlanger@clunet.edu
Ervin, Delbert J [604] California Lutheran University; 60 W Olsen Rd; Thousand Oaks CA 91360-2787 USA; delbertj@clunet.edu
Ewald, Karla M [537] Association for Retarded Citizens of Greensboro; 207 M South Westgate Dr; Greensboro NC 27407 USA

Fagen, Michael [545] University of Illinois at Chicago; Health Research and Policy Centers; 850 W Jackson Blvd Ste 400; Chicago IL 60607 USA; mfaegen1@uic.edu
Farland, Dale S [706] Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008-5237 USA; dalefarland@wmich.edu
Farland, Joan P [326] Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008-5237 USA; joanfarland@wmich.edu
Farnham, Angela Adan [349] University of Illinois; Center for Prevention Research and Development; 921 W Van Buren Ste 210; Chicago IL 60607 USA; a-adan@uic.edu
Farnham, Rebecca J [433] 11033 Indian Legends Dr Apt 204; Louisville KY 40241 USA; becsangel@hotmail.com
Fawson, Trude [536  770] Training Impact Group Inc; 1200 County Rd 422; Idaho Springs CO 80452 USA; tfawson@trainingimpactgroup.com
Fear, Frank [407] Michigan State University; 323 Natural Resources Bldg; East Lansing MI 48824 USA; fear@msu.edu
Feller, Irwin [327] Pennsylvania State University; 2217 Earth-Engineering Science Bldg Rm 421; University Park PA 16803 USA; igi@psu.edu
Feroz, Barbara A [619  715] Indiana University of Pennsylvania; Dept of Sociology - 102 McElhaney Hall; 441 North Walk; Indiana PA 15705 USA; bferozz@csmonline.net
Ferrante, John [433] Northern Kentucky University; Dept of Sociology, Anthropology and Philosophy; Highland Heights KY 41099 USA; ferrantej@nku.edu
Fetterman, David [331  378  404  781] 520 Barron St; Menlo Park CA 94025 USA; davidf@stanford.edu
Filbin, Gerald J [302] US Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Policy Economics and Innovation (1807); 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW; Washington DC 20460 USA; filbin.gerald@epa.gov
Finch, Nicole [731] Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc; PO Box 1348; Charleston WV 25325 USA
Finigan, Michael W [718] NPC Research Inc; 5200 SW Macadam Ave Ste 420; Portland OR 97201 USA; finigan@npcresearch.com
Finkbiner, Richard [391] Caliber Associates; 10530 Rosehaven St Ste 400; Fairfax VA 22030 USA; finkbinr@calib.com
Finney, Pamela B [433] SERVE; PO Box 5367; Greensboro NC 27435 USA; pfinney@serve.org
Firth, Kathleen [342] Oakes Villa Rehabilitation Unit; Calderdale & Huddersfield NHS Trust; Willwood Ave; Huddersfield HD3 4YA ENGLAND
Fischer, Robert L [377  615] Case Western Reserve University; Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences; 10900 Euclid Ave; Cleveland OH 44106-7164 USA; fischer@po.case.edu
Fisher, Evie [433  758] Colorado Dept of Corrections; 2862 S Circle; Colorado Springs CO 80906 USA; evie.fisher@doc.state.co.us
Fisher, Robert L [787] Illinois Professional Learners’ Partnership; College of Education; College of Education Campus Box 5300; Normal IL 61790-5300 USA; rlfisher@ilstu.edu
Fitzgerald, Hiram [407] Michigan State University; Kellogg Center; East Lansing MI 48824 USA; fitzger9@msu.edu
Fitzgerald, Katie [525] WK Kellogg Foundation; One Michigan Ave E; Battle Creek MI 49017-4058 USA; katie.fitzgerald@wwkf.org
Fitzpatrick, Tina [619  715] Indiana University of Pennsylvania; Dept of Sociology; McElhaney Hall; Indiana PA 15705 USA; missfitz79@hotmail.com
Flaherty Jr, John F [813] WestEd; 4665 Lampson Ave; Los Alamitos CA 90720 USA; jflaher@wested.org
Flanigan, Carolyn B [433] 621 Ravine Rd; E Dundee IL 60118 USA; CBFlanigan@aol.com
Flasphohler, Paul [361  404] University of South Carolina; Institute for Families in Society; Columbia SC 29208 USA; flasphohler@usc.edu
Fletcher, Jane [738] Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability; 111 W Madison St Ste 312; Tallahassee FL 32339-1475 USA; fletcher.jane@mail.oppaga.state.fl.us
Florin, Paul [765  814] University of Rhode Island; Dept of Psychology; Kingston RI 02881 USA; pflorin@uri.edu
Floyd, Anita G [361] University of South Carolina; Institute for Families in Society; Columbia SC 29208 USA; aflloyd@gwm.sc.edu
Floyd, Randy G [801] The University of Memphis; Dept of Psychology; 202 Psychology Bldg; Memphis TN 38152-3230 USA; rdfloyd@memphis.edu
Flynn, James P [602] University of Delaware; School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy; 180 Graham Hall; Newark DE 19716 USA; Jflynn@udel.edu
Folkman, Daniel V [550] University of Milwaukee-Milwaukee Outreach; Center for Urban Community Development; 161 West Wisconsin Ave Ste 6000; Milwaukee WI 53203 USA; folkman@uwu.edu
Fong, Joanna [608] Roosevelt Middle School; 460 Arguello Blvd; San Francisco CA 94118 USA
Fort, Lora [417] 2515 Spencer Rd; Silver Spring MD 20910 USA; lfort@worldbank.org
Fortin, Jean Paul [745] Université Laval; Pavillon de l’Est; 2180 chemin Ste-Foy bureau 2110; Sainte-Foy QC G1K 7P4 CANADA; jpfortin@msp.ulaval.ca
Foss, Mark A [358] Chestnut Health Systems; 4408 Truxel Rd Apt 86; Sacramento CA 95834 USA
Foster, Barbara F [322  407] 1310 Cross Creek Circle Ste C; Tallahassee FL 32301 USA; bfoster@hsc.usf.edu
Foster-Fishman, Pennie G [407  525  604] Michigan State University; Dept of Psychology; 135 Synder; East Lansing MI 48824 USA; fosterfi@msu.edu
Fox, Lynn [323] American University; School of Education McKinley Bldg; 4400 Massachusetts Ave NW; Washington DC 20016 USA; lynn.fox@american.edu
Franchak, Stephen J [423] 911 Acri Rd; Mechanicsburg PA 17050-2268 USA; sjfranchak@aol.com
Franklin, Jennifer [355] California State University at Dominguez Hills; Office SBS F-117; 1000 E Victoria St; Carson CA 90747 USA; JFRANKLIN@csudh.edu
Frawley, Chris [332] Virginia Commonwealth University; Training and Technical Assistance Center; PO Box 842020; Richmond VA 23284-2020 USA; cdfrawley@vcu.edu
Fraze, Jami [717] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 4770 Buford Hwy NE MS K-40; Atlanta GA 30341-3717 USA; JFraze@cdc.gov
Frazier, Johnnie E [329] US Dept of Commerce; Office of Inspector General; 14th and Constitution Ave NW; Washington DC 20230 USA; jfrazier@oig.doc.gov
Frichtling, Joy [338] Westat; 1650 Research Blvd; Rockville MD 20850 USA; FrechtJ1@westat.com
Friedman, Victor J [550] Ruppin Institute; Dept of Behavioral Sciences; Emek Hefer 40250 ISRAEL; victorf@ruppin.ac.il
Frierson, Henry T [554] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; 121 Peabody Hall CB 3833; Chapel Hill NC 27599 USA; ht_frierson@unc.edu
Frismann, Linda [312] Connecticut Dept of Mental Health and Addiction Services; 410 Capitol Ave 4th Fl; PO Box 341431; Hartford CT 06106 USA; Linda.Frismann@uconn.edu
Frith, Larry  [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 S Front St MS 509; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; larry.frith@ode.state.oh.us
Fujii, Milton [367] University of California Office of the President; Planning and Budget, DANR; 300 Lakeside Dr 6th Fl; Oakland CA 94612-3550 USA; milton.fujii@ucop.edu
Fulwider, Donald G [304] US General Accounting Office; Office of Special Investigations Rm 6k17S; 441 G St NW; Washington DC 20548 USA; FulwiderD@gao.gov

Gabriel, Roy [766] RMC Research Corporation; 522 SW 5th Ave Ste 1407; Portland OR 97204-2131 USA; roy_gabriel@rmccorp.com
Gagnon, Marie-Pierre [745] Universite Laval; Pavillon de l'Est; 2180 chemin Ste-Foy; Sainte-Foy QC G1K 7P4 CANADA; marie-pierre.gagnon@ext.msp.ulaval.ca
Gamota, George [327] Science and Technology Management Associates; 1646 Massachusetts Ave Ste 21; Lexington MA 0240-5311 USA; ggamota@gis.net
Gamse, Beth [882] Abt Associates Inc; 55 Wheeler St; Cambridge MA 02138 USA; beth_gamse@abtassoc.com
Ganesan, Radha [335] 330 Huntington Hall; Syracuse NY 13244 USA; rganesan@syms.syr.edu
Garcia, Francisco [341] US Dept of Education; Office of Migrant Education; 400 Maryland Ave SW; Washington DC 20202 USA
Gargani, John [320  569] 6431 Hillegass Ave; Oakland CA 94618 USA; jgargani@uclink4.berkeley.edu
Garvin-Doxas, Kathy [725] University of Colorado; Alliance for Technology, Learning, & Society; 320 UCB Duane C123; Boulder CO 80309 USA; Garvindo@ucsub.co.edu
Gathercoal, Paul [760] California Lutheran University; 60 West Olsen Rd; Thousand Oaks CA 91360-2787 USA; gatherco@clunet.edu
Gayler, Keith [115] Policy Studies Associates; 1718 Connecticut Ave NW Ste 400; Washington DC 20009 USA; kgayler@policystudies.com
Gehrie, Cynthia P [787] Video Documentation Partnership; PO Box 1305; Highland Park IL 60035 USA; vdf19@email.msn.com
Germuth, Amy A [358] University of Delaware; Delaware Education Research & Development Center; 104A Pearson Hall; Newark DE 19716 USA; giancola@udel.edu
Giard, Julienne [721] University of South Florida - Dept of Mental Health Law and Policy; Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute; 13301 Bruce B Downs Blvd MHC 2633; Tampa FL 33612 USA; giard@fmhi.usf.edu
Gienapp, Anne [600] The Evaluation Forum; 1932 First Ave Ste 408; Seattle WA 98101 USA; agienapp@organizationalresearch.com
Giesen, Judy L [412] University of Alabama; Dept of Educational Research; Box 870231; Tuscaloosa AL 35487 USA; jgiesen@bamaed.ua.edu
Ginexi, Elizabeth M [358] Westat; 1650 Research Blvd; Rockville MD 20850 USA; ElizabethGinexi@Westat.com
Gingiss, Phyllis M [801] University of Houston; College of Education; Dept of Health and Human Performance; Houston TX 77204-6321 USA; pmgingiss@uh.edu
Giordono, Leanne [737] Abt Associates Inc; 55 Wheeler St; Cambridge MA 02138 USA; leanne_giordono@abtassoc.com
Glaser, Eric [763] United Way of America; 701 N Fairfax St; Alexandria VA 22312 USA; Eric.Glaser@uwa.unitedway.org
Glass, Daniel [433] 85 N Middletown Rd Apt D3; Nanuet NY USA; dglass@glenmartinassociates.com
Glassman, Marlene [512] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Division of Cancer Prevention and Control Comprehensive Approaches to Cancer Prevention and Control Unit; MS K -57 4770 Buford Highway NE; Atlanta GA 30341 USA; llg5@cdc.gov
Glascoe, Michael [306] Dept of Educational Accountability; Dunn Loring Administrative Center; 2334 Gallows Rd; Dunn Loring VA 22027 USA; michael.glascoe@fcps.edu
Glaser, Eric [763] United Way of America; 701 N Fairfax St; Alexandria VA 22312 USA; Eric.Glaser@uwa.unitedway.org
Goff, Laurie [370] AIDS Project Los Angeles; 3550 Wilshire Blvd Ste 300; Los Angeles CA 90010 USA; lgoff@apla.org
Gold, Norman [401] COSMOS Corporation; 3 Bethesda Metro Center Ste 950; Bethesda MD 20814 USA; ngold@cosmossCorp.com
Goldenberg, Margareth [514] Rua Dr Olavo Egidio 287 - 160 Andar - Santana; Sao Paulo SP 02037-000 BRAZIL; mgoldenberg@ias.org.br
Golding, Robert [603] Tulane University; Louisiana Alliance; 1338 Audubon St; New Orleans LA 70118 USA
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Gonçalves, Helenice Maia [767] Rua Mascarenhas de Moraes; 96 ap 504; Copacabana; Rio de Janeiro RJ 22030040 BRAZIL; helemaia@uol.com.br
González, Erualdo R [751] University of California Irvine; 202 Social Ecology 1; Irvine CA 92697-7075 USA; ergonzal@uci.edu
Goodkind, Sara [596] University of Michigan; School of Social Work; 1080 S University; Ann Arbor MI 48109-1106 USA; sgoodkin@umich.edu
Goodman, Irene F [433] Goodman Research Group Inc; 30 JFK St 3rd Fl; Cambridge MA 02139 USA; igoodman@grginc.com
Goodman, Pamela [623] Baptist Community Ministries; 1450 Poydras St Ste 1550; New Orleans LA 70112-6010 USA; pgoodman@bcm.org
Goodyear, Leslie [107 351 419] City Year; 285 Columbus Ave; Boston MA 02116 USA; lgoodyear@cityyear.org
Gopal, Gita [368] The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-306; Washington DC 20433 USA; ggp@worldbank.org
Goyol, Apollos B [602] 2300 Inverness Ln Apt 204; Kalamazoo MI 49048 USA; a98goyol@hotmail.com
Grace, David [340] University of Alberta; Academic Technologies for Learning - University Extension Centre; 8303-112 St; Edmonton AB T6G 2T4 CANADA; dgrace@connect.ab.ca
Graham, Phillip W [316 433] RTI International; PO Box 12194; Research Triangle Park NC 27709 USA; pgraham@rti.org
Grant, Laura [433] Xerox Corporation; Rts 7 and 659; Leesburg VA 20176 USA; laura.grant@usa.xerox.com
Grant, Melanie B [619 715] 773 S 6th St; Indiana PA 15701 USA; MelanieGrant@msn.com
Grantham, Marilyn H [388] University of Minnesota; 466 Coffey Hall; 1420 Eckles Ave; St Paul MN 55108-6070 USA; grant005@umn.edu
Grasso, Patrick G [325 605 626] The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-305; Washington DC 20433 USA; pgrasso@worldbank.org
Gratz, Zandra S [715] 227 Toronto Ave; Massapequa NY 11758 USA; zggratz@aol.com
Grob, George F [103 304 329 576 769] US Dept of Health and Human Services; Office of Inspector General; 330 Independence Ave SW Rm 5236; Washington DC 20201 USA; ggrob@oig.hhs.gov
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Mislevy, Robert J [749] University of Maryland; Rm 1230-C Benjamin Bldg; College Park MD 20742 USA; rm257@umail.umd.edu

Mitchell, Cheryl [717] Emory University; Rollins School of Public Health; 1518 Clifton Rd NE; Atlanta GA 30322 USA; kminer@sph.emory.edu

Moller, Ruth A [558] Michigan Public Health Institute; 3055 Plymouth Rd Ste 204; Ann Arbor MI 48105 USA; ruthmohr@pilot.msu.edu

Mokanski, Janice [330] Ministry of the Solicitor General; Ontario Police College; Box 1190; Aylmer ON N5H 2T2 CANADA; janice.mokanski@ijs.gov.on.ca

Molina, Eduardo A [569 732] 5622 Delmar Blvd Apt 404; St Louis OH 63112 USA; molinaea@slu.edu

Monahan, Kathleen M [433] Child Health Data Lab; Children's Memorial Institute for Education and Research; 2300 Children's Plaza No 157; Chicago IL 60614 USA; kmonahan@childrensmemorial.org

Mooney, Kathleen [433] Serve; PO Box 5367; Greensboro NC 27435 USA; kmooney@serve.org

Moore, Richard [734] Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning; Lucas State Office Bldg; 321 E 12th St; Des Moines IA 50319 USA; dick.moore@cjip.state ia.us

Morgan, Eileen [433] Glen Martin Associates; 112 First St; Troy NY 12180 USA; amoorse@glenmartinassociates.com

Moran, Seana [388] Harvard Graduate School of Education; Project IF - Inventing the Future; Cambridge MA 02138 USA; morane@gsf.harvard.edu

Morissette, Linda [588] Prince George's County Public Schools; Sasscer Administration Bldg; 14201 School Ln Rm 138; Upper Marlboro, MD 20772 USA; smdorars@pgcps.org

Mohan, Rakesh [376 423 807] Allder Glen Dr SE; Lacey WA 98513 USA; rmohan10@attbi.com

Morell, Jonathan A [106 714] 2279 Mershon; Ann Arbor MI 48103 USA; jonny.morell@altarum.org

Morgan, Glen [322] National Cancer Institute; Tobacco Control Research Branch; 6130 Executive Blvd EPN Room 4034; Rockville MD 20852 USA; gm124w@nih.gov

Morgan, Jane F [804] 16709 Greenview; Detroit MI 48219 USA; jmorgan@gte.net

Morra-Imes, Linda [626] International Finance Corporation; Operations Evaluation Group; 2101 Pennsylvania Ave NW; Washington DC 20433 USA; lmoora@ifc.org
Morris, Michael [704] University of New Haven; Psychology Dept; West Haven CT 06516 USA; mmorris@newhaven.edu
Morrison, Martha [700] Casey Family Services; One Corporate Dr Ste 515; Shelton CT 06484 USA; mdore@caseyfamilyservices.org
Morrison-Rodriguez, Barbara [337] BMR Consulting; 16703 Blenheim Dr; Lutz FL 3354-6815 USA; bmorris4@tampabay.rr.com
Moss-Summers, Vanessa [433 536 770] Xerox Corporation; Rts 7 and 659; Leesburg VA 20176 USA; vanessa.moss-summers@usa.xerox.com
Moster, Kristina M [433] The Greater Cincinnati Foundation; 200 West 4th St; Cincinnati OH 45202 USA; kmoster@greatercincinnati.org
Motes, Patricia S [361] University of South Carolina; Institute for Families in Society; Columbia SC 29208 USA; pmotes@gwm.sc.edu
Motylewski, Karen [622] Institute of Museum and Library Services; 1100 Pennsylvania Ave NW; Washington DC 20506 USA; kmotylewski@imls.gov
Mountain, Leigh [595] State University of New York at Albany; Indian Quad B-7; 1400 Washington Ave; Albany NY 12222 USA; eval@csu.albany.edu
Mountain, Leigh A [796] State University of New York at Albany; Indian Quad B-7; 1400 Washington Ave; Albany NY 12222 USA; eval@csu.albany.edu
Mowbray, Carol T [320] University of Michigan; School of Social Work; 1080 S University Rm 2734; Ann Arbor MI 48109-1106 USA
Muck, Randy [742] Center for Substance Abuse Treatment; Office of Evaluation Scientific Analysis and Synthesis; 5515 Security Ln Rockwall II Ste 740; Rockville MD 20852 USA; rmuck@samhsa.gov
Mueller, Patricia A [393 549 751 777] Indiana University - Indiana Center for Evaluation; Smith Research Center Ste 100; 2805 E 10th St; Bloomington IN 47403 USA; pmuller@indiana.edu
Mulvaney, Shelagh [346] University of Vermont, Fletcher Allen Healthcare; Dept of Pediatrics; 111 Colchester Ave; Burlington VT 05401 USA; mulvaneysu@u.arizona.edu
Mulvey, Stephen L [433 718 742] Center for Substance Abuse Treatment; Office of Evaluation Scientific Analysis and Synthesis; 5600 Fishers Ln Rockwall II Ste 840; Rockville MD 20857 USA; kmulvey@samhsa.gov
Mundy, Eric J [340 621] The University of Akron; Center for Policy Studies; The Polsky Bldg Rm 285; Akron OH 44325-1911 USA; emundy@uakron.edu
Munoz, Andrew [107] City Year; 285 Columbus Ave; Boston MA 02116 USA; amunoz@cityyear.org
Munoz, Marco A [306 345 528 707 760] Jefferson County Public Schools; Accountability Research and Planning Dept; 3332 Newburg Rd; Louisville KY 40218 USA; mmunoz2@jefferson.k12.ky.us
Murray, Mary E [362 580] 1202 P St NW #B; Washington DC 20005 USA; mary_e_murray@yahoo.com
Murray-Ward, Mildred [433 533 760] California Lutheran University; School of Education; 60 S Olsen Rd; Thousand Oaks CA 91360-2787 USA; mmward@clunet.edu
Mushi, Selina [433 Northeastern Illinois University; 5500 North St Louis Ave; Chicago IL 60625 USA; S-Mushi@neiu.edu
Mutchler, Matt G [370 433 515] AIDS Project Los Angeles; 3550 Wilshire Blvd Ste 300; Los Angeles CA 90010 USA; mmutchler@apla.org
Myers, Mary Anne [802] Wayne State University; Center for Urban Studies; 3040 Faculty Administration Bldg; Detroit MI 48202 USA; n.nahan@wayne.edu
Nair, Ajay T [423] University of Virginia; PO Box 400 708; Charlottesville VA 22904-4708 USA; atn6@virginia.edu
Nakula, Michael [388] Harvard Graduate School of Education; Risk and Prevention Program; 505 Larsen Hall Appian Way; Cambridge MA 02138 USA
Naples, Larisa M [102] LMN Evaluations; 2533 Lincoln Ave; Belmont CA 94002 USA
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Narayanaswamy, Nithya [707] University of Cincinnati; Evaluation Services Center; PO Box 210105; Cincinnati OH 45221-0105 USA

Navarro, Rudy [513] Governor's Division of Drug Policy; 1700 W Washington Ste 101; Phoenix AZ 85007 USA; mnavarro@az.gov

Neace, William P [707] Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation; 1300 S 4th St Ste 350; Louisville KY 40208 USA; Neace@pire.org

Neeley, Grant W [802] University of Cincinnati; Institute for Policy Research; PO Box 210132; Cincinnati OH 45221-0105 USA; Grant.Neeley@uc.edu

Neenan, Peter [617] 19 Benchmark 19 Fearrington Post; Pittsboro NC 27312 USA; Pneenan@ix.netcom.com

Neff, Duane [513] Governor's Division of Drug Policy; 1700 W Washington Ste 101; Phoenix AZ 85007 USA; dneff@az.gov

Nelson, Catherine Awsumb [536] 55898 Cedar Ln; Paw Paw MI 49079 USA; awsumb@calnet.net

Nelson, Cathy [433] 13603 Flanagan Blvd; Boys Town NE 68010 USA; nelson@girlsandboystown.org

Nelson, Christopher D [573 755] Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008 USA; christopher.nelson@wmich.edu

Nelson-Barber, Sharon [759] WestEd; 4200-A Farm Hill Blvd; Redwood City CA 94061-1048 USA; snelson@wested.org

Netwick, David A [718] State University of New York at Albany; Indian Quad B-7; 1400 Washington Ave; Albany NY 12222 USA; eval@csc.albany.edu

Newbill, Sharon [113] 1900 Leonard SE; Rio Rancho NM USA; snewbill@indiana.edu

Newcomb, Tina [315] 351 Wagoner Dr; Fayetteville NC 28303 USA; tnewcomb@ccfpc.org

Newcomer, Kathryn E [799] 805 21 St NW Ste 601; Washington DC 20052 USA; tnewcomer@gwu.edu

Newman, Dianna L [393 429 595 718 796] State University of New York at Albany; Indian Quad B-7; 1400 Washington Ave; Albany NY 12222 USA; dnewman@uamail.albany.edu

Newman, Frederick L [116 403 420 708] 145 NE 94th St; Miami Shores FL 33138 USA; newmanf@fiu.edu

Newman, Michael E [433] Mississippi State University Extension Service; Organizational Development; Box 9660; Mississippi State MS 39762 USA; mnewman@ext.msstate.edu

Newton, Stephen P [433] 660 Figueroa Dr; Altadena CA 91001 USA; snett1@lausd.k12.ca.us

Nguyen, Hung [718] Alcohol & Drug Services Research Institute; 2101 Alexian Dr; San Jose CA 95116 USA; hung.nguyen@hhs.co.santa-clara.ca.us

Nicholas, Will [313] Los Angeles County Proposition 10 Commission; 333 S Beaudry Ave Ste 2100; Los Angeles CA 90017 USA; wnicholas@prop10.org

Nichols, Allison H [388] West Virginia University Extension Service; 603 Kapp Hall; Morgantown WV 26506-6031 USA; anichols@wvu.edu

Nichols, Tristi C [368 425 616] Manitou Inc; 981 Main St 2nd Fl; Peekskill NY 10566 USA; tnhichols@manitouinc.com

Nigh, William [572] Center for Integrated Family and Health Services; 560 S San Jose Ave; Covina CA 91723 USA; bnigh@CIFHS.org

Nilsson, Kajsa [433] PO Box 45316; Stockholm 104 30 SWEDEN; kajsa.nilsson@esv.se

Noga, Janice E [345 556] University of Cincinnati; Evaluation Services Center; PO Box 210105; Cincinnati OH 45221-0105 USA; jnoga@uc.edu

Novicoff, Wendy M [301] University of Virginia; Dept of Health Evaluation Sciences; Box 800717 HSC; Charlottesville VA 22908 USA; wnovicoff@virginia.edu

Novotney, Laurence C [371] Information Technology International; 10000 Falls Rd Ste 214; Potomac MD 20854 USA; Inovotney@ITIincorporated.com

Nuddelman, Jodi [576] US Dept of Health and Human Services; Office of Inspector General; 26 Federal Plaza Rm 41-106; New York NY 10278 USA; jnuddelman@oig.hhs.gov

O'Keefe, Maureen L [412 707] Baylor University; PO Box 97322; Waco TX 76798 USA; Joe_Nyre@baylor.edu
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Oats, Robert G [369 412] Father Flanagan's Boys' Home; Youth Care Building; 13603 Flanagan Blvd; Boys Town NE 68010 USA; oatr@boystown.org

Obeidallah-Davis, Dawn [737] Abt Associates Inc; 55 Wheeler St; Cambridge MA 02138 USA; dawn_obeidallah@abtassoc.com

O'Brien, Eileen [433] US Dept of Health and Human Services; Switzer Bldg 330 C St NW Rm 2332; Washington DC 20201 USA; eo'brien@act.dhhs.gov

O'Fir, Zenda M [581] EvalNet; PO Box 41829 Craighall 2024; Johannesburg SOUTH AFRICA; zenda@evalnet.co.za

Ogata, Pamela C [433 580] Office of AIDS Programs and Policy; Research and Evaluation Division; 600 S Commonwealth Ave Rm 200; Los Angeles CA 90005 USA; pogata@dhs.co.ca.us

O'Keefe, Maureen L [433 758] Colorado Dept of Corrections; 2862 S Circle; Colorado Springs CO 80906 USA; maureen.okeefe@doc.state.co.us
Olivier, Evelyn R [564] University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Brisco Library; 7703 Floyd Curl Dr MC 7940; San Antonio TX 78229-3900 USA; olivier@uthscsa.edu

Olmos-Gallo, Pablo A [433] 4141 E Dickenson Place; Denver CO 80222 USA; aolmos@mhcd.com

Olney, Cynthia A [564  701] University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Educational Research and Development; 7703 Floyd Curl Dr MC 7895; San Antonio TX 78229-3900 USA; olney@uthscsa.edu

Orchowsky, Stan [371  416  734] Justice Research and Statistics Association; 777 N Capitol St Ste 801; Washington DC 20002 USA; sorchows@jrsa.org

Ormsby, Colin [110] WestEd; 300 Lakeside Dr 18th Fl; Oakland CA 94612 USA; ormsby@wested.org

Orosz, Joel J [559] Grand Valley State University; Dorothy A Johnson Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership; 401 W Fulton St 238C DeVos Center; Grand Rapids MI 49504 USA; oroszj@gvsu.edu

Ortega, Sandra [593] The Ounce of Prevention Fund of Florida; 111 N Gadsden St Ste 200; Tallahassee FL 32301 USA; sortega@ounce.org

Ortiz, Rhonda M [407  558] The California Endowment; 21650 Oxnard St Ste 1200; Woodland Hills CA 91367 USA; rortiz@calendow.org

Orwin, Robert G [116  358  630  802] Westat; 1650 Research Blvd; Rockville MD 20850 USA; RobertOrwin@Westat.com

O'Sullivan, Elizabeth Ann [588] North Carolina State University; Dept of Political Science & Public Administration; Box 8102; Raleigh NC 27695-8102 USA; elizabethann_osullivan@ncsu.edu

O'Sullivan, Rita [313  378  741] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Education; Evaluation Assessment and Policy Connections; CB 2901; Chapel Hill NC 27599 USA; ritao@unc.edu

Padden, Jeffrey [380  750  774] Public Policy Associates; 119 Pere Marquette Dr Ste 1-C; Lansing MI 48912-1231 USA; paddenjd@publicpolicy.com

Paek, Pamela L [731] Educational Testing Service; 1000 Broadway Ste 310; Oakland CA 94607 USA; ppaek@ets.org

Page, Bethany [313] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Education; Evaluation Assessment and Policy Connections; CB 2901; Chapel Hill NC 27599 USA; ritao@unc.edu

Pahl, Dale A [703] 1009 W Markham Ave; Durham NC 27701 USA; pahl.dale@epa.gov

Pampalone, Sacha Z [721] Poudre Health Services District; 120 Bristlecone Dr; Fort Collins CO 80524 USA; spampalone@healthdistrict.org

Pangallo, Marco [407] Heritage Elementary School; 5052 Hamilton-Mason Rd; Hamilton OH 45011-9199 USA; Marco.Pangallo@lakotaonline.com

Pangilinan, Ruth [433] 1147 Garfield Ave; San Jose CA 95125 USA; ruthpangilinan@aol.com

Parkany, Richard A [388  715] 38 Brookline Dr; Utica NY 13501 USA; rparkany@borg.com

Parkin, Crysta L [316] Olmsted County Community Services; 2116 Campus Dr SE; Rochester MN 55904 USA; parkin.crysta@co.olmsted.mn.us

Parra, Juan M [701] University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Dept of Pediatrics; 7703 Floyd Curl Dr MC 7808; San Antonio TX 78229-3900 USA; parraj@uthscsa.edu

Parsons, Beverly A [413] InSites; PO Box 1710; 1985 W Portal Rd; Grand Lake CO 80447-1710 USA; bevandpar@aol.com

Parsons, Bruce [575] University of Southern California; Graduate School of Social Work; 395 S 1500 East Room 111; Salt Lake City UT 84112-0260 USA; Bruce.Parsons@socwk.utah.edu

Patay, Heather [787] Chicago Teachers’ Center; 700 N Halsted St; Chicago IL 60622 USA; ehp@interaccess.com

Patel, Mahesh [356] UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office; Nairobi KENYA; mpatel@unicef.org

Patrick, Michael [357] University of Wisconsin – Madison; Dept of Medical Genetics - Wisconsin Teacher Enhancement in Biology; 104 Genetics Building/445 Henry Mall; Madison WI 53706 USA; mpatrick@facstaff.wisc.edu

Patterson, Julie M [340] University of California; Graduate School of Education; 341 Child Study Tower; 555 N. La Honda Road; Stanford CA 94305 USA; jmpp38@po.cwru.edu

Patterson, Marvin [369] Florida Dept of Education; 325 W Gaines St Rm 424; Tallahassee FL 32399 USA; patternm@mail.doe.state.fl.us

Patton, Lisa [709] Norther Colorado Gunman Information Technology Health Solutions and Services (NGIT); 1700 Research Blvd Ste; Rockville MD 20850 USA

Patton, Michael Quinn [303  330  378  591  728  765  798] 3228 46th Ave S; Minneapolis MN 55406 USA; MQPatton@Prodigy.net

Paulson, Robert [591] University of South Florida; Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute; 13301 Bruce B Downs Blvd MHC 1501; Tampa FL 33612 USA; rpaulson@fmi.usf.edu

Pearson, Frank S [410] 71 W 23rd St 8th Fl; New York NY 10010 USA; frank.pearson@ndri.org

Pendergast, Karen [433] RTI International; PO Box 12194; Research Triangle Park NC 27709 USA; pendergast@rti.org
Penley, Julie [320] University of Texas at El Paso; Partnership for Excellence in Teacher Education; University 904 Education Bldg; El Paso TX 79968 USA
Penna-Ferre, Thereza [767] Copacabana; Rua Dias da Rocha, 55 - Apt 801; Rio de Janeiro RJ 22051-020 BRAZIL; aval@cesgranrio.org.br
Penney, Naomi E [328] 20 Bradford Heights; Syracuse NY 13224 USA; npenney@earthlink.net
Penney, Naomi G [328] Cornell University; Deot of Policy Analysis & Management; MVR Hall; Ithaca NY 14853 USA; ng2@cornell.edu
Penuel, William R [749] SRI International; 333 Ravenswood Ave; Menlo Park CA 94025 USA
Perez, Barbara C [802] Butler County Mental Health Board; 5963 Boymelt Dr; Fairfield OH 45014-5541 USA; bperez@bcmbh.org
Perez, Javier [433] Advocacy & Empowerment for Minorities Program; 1640 W Roosevelt Rd - M/C626; Chicago IL 60608 USA; xavier1@ucc.edu
Perez, Mario J [433] Los Angeles County of AIDS Programs and Policy; Prevention and Client Services; 600 S Commonwealth Ave 6th Fl; Los Angeles CA 90005 USA; mperez@dhs.co.la.ca.us
Perreault, Michel [402] McGill University; Douglas Hospital Research Centre; 6875 LaSalle Blvd; Verdun QC H4H 1R3 CANADA; permic@mcgill.ca
Perry, Katye M [612 713] Oklahoma State University; School of Educational Studies; 433 Willard Hall; Stillwater OK 74078-4045 USA; kperry@okstate.edu
Perry, Michael [514] Western Virginia Public Education Consortium; PO Box 7035; Radford VA 24142 USA; mperry2@radford.edu
Pessoa-Brandao, Luisa [519] Rainbow Research Inc; 621 W Lake St; Minneapolis MN 55408 USA; lbrandao@mtn.org
Peterson, Sarah E [334] Caliber Associates; 10530 Rosehaven St Ste 400; Fairfax VA 22030 USA; poworski@calib.com
Pevny, Lance [737] Corporation for National and Community Service; Dept of Research and Policy Development; 1201 New York Ave NW; Washington DC 20525 USA; lpotter@cns.gov
Pew, Stephen [774] Creative Research Associates; 2030 E Broadway Ste 221; Tucson AZ 85719 USA; svpowers@aol.com
Poythress, Norman [530] University of South Florida; Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute; 13301 Bruce B Downs Blvd MHC 2639; Tampa FL 33612 USA; poythres@fmhi.usf.edu
Praet, Dan [355] University of British Columbia; Dept of Educational Studies; Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4 CANADA; dan.praet@ubc.ca
Preskill, Hallie [352 387 414 550 568 592 728] University of New Mexico; College of Education EDOF 114; Organizational Learning & Instructional Technologies; Albuquerque NM 87131 USA; hpresk@unm.edu
Price, Kathy [516] US Dept of Education; Office of Postsecondary Education - Teacher Quality Enhancement Program for States and Partnerships; 1990 K St NW Ste 6147; Washington DC 20006-8525 USA
Pryor, Tisha [433] Center for Children and Technology; 96 Morton St 7th Fl; New York NY 10014 USA; tpryor@edc.org
Pulis, Lee [326] 921 Long Pond Rd; Plymouth MA 02360 USA; lee_pulis@terc.edu
Puzone, Carol [381] American Red Cross; 431 18th St NW 2nd Fl; Washington DC 20006-5304 USA; puzonec@usa.redcross.org

Qualters, Judy [717] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1600 Clifton Rd NE MS E-19; Atlanta GA 30333 USA; jqualters@cdc.gov
Quellmalz, Edys S [749] SRI International; 333 Ravenswood Ave; Menlo Park CA 94025 USA
Quézada, Geraldina V [363] 100 Western Ave G-11; Kalamazoo MI 49008-1062 USA; geravillalobos@hotmail.com
Quist, Ryan [622] Claremont Graduate University; School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences; 123 E 8th St; Claremont CA 91711 USA; Ryan.quist@cgu.edu

Race, Kathryn EH [357 720] 4430 N Winchester Ave; Chicago IL 60640 USA; race_associates@msn.com
Radis, Ellen [391] Caliber Associates; 10530 Rosehaven St Ste 400; Fairfax VA 22030 USA; radise@calib.com
Rahamian, Afshaneh [433] Child Health Data Lab; Children's Memorial Institute for Education and Research; 2300 Children's Plaza No 157; Chicago IL 60614 USA; afsanehrah@yahoo.com
Rahman, Ali [433] University of District of Columbia; Psychology Dept; 4200 Connecticut Avenue NW; Washington DC 20008 USA
Rai, Kalyani [365] University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Outreach; Center for Urban Community Development; 161 W Wisconsin Ave Ste 6000; Milwaukee WI 53211 USA; kalyanir@uwm.edu
Raikes, Helen [394] US Dept of Health and Human Services, ACYF; Mary Switzer Building Rm 2128; 330 C St SW; Washington DC 20201 USA; helen_raikes@gallup.com
Raizen, Senta A [720] National Center for Improving Science Education/West End Inc; 1724 M St NW Ste 704; Washington DC 20036 USA; raizen@ncise.org
Rajgopal, Radhika [393 777] Indiana University - Indiana Center for Evaluation; Smith Research Center Ste 100; 2805 E 10th St; Bloomington IN 47403 USA; rajigopal@indiana.edu
Rallis, Sharon F [798 816] 86 Blueberry Ln; Jamestown RI 02835 USA; sharonrallis@earthlink.net
Ramirez, Juan R [758] Claremont Graduate University; Dept of Psychology; 123 E 8th St; Claremont CA 91711 USA; juan.ramirez@cgu.edu
Ramsden, Sharon A [309 715 800] WestEd; 4665 Lampson Ave; Los Alamitos CA 90720 USA; SRamsde@wested.org
Randall, Njoki [733] 2550 Akers Mill Rd Apt R6; Atlanta GA 30339 USA; Mnjoki@aol.com
Randolph, Fran [802] Center for Mental Health Services - Homeless Programs Branch; Parklawn Bldg Rm 11C-05; 5600 Fishers Ln; Rockville MD 20857 USA; Frandolph@samhsa.gov
Ray, Marilyn L [570 768] Finger Lakes Law & Social Policy Center Inc; 96 Besemer Rd; Ithaca NY 14850 USA; MLR17@cornell.edu
Rayyes, Nada [309] WestEd; 4665 Lampson Ave; Los Alamitos CA 90720 USA; nrayyes@wested.org
Reams, Paula [340] Center for Healthy Communities; 140 East Monument Ave; Dayton OH 45402 USA; paula.reams@kmcnetwork.com
Recio, Manuel [341] Pennsylvania Dept of Education; Division of Migrant Education; 333 Market St 5th Fl; Harrisburg PA 17126-0333 USA; mrecio@state.pa.us
Redfield, Doris L [354] Appalachian Educational Laboratory Inc; PO Box 1348; Charleston WV 25325-1348 USA; redfield@ael.org
Reed, Charlotte [516] Indiana University Northwest - UTEP; School of Education; 3400 Broadway; Gary IN 46408 USA; creed@iu.edu
Reed, Winifred L [347 416] US Dept of Justice; National Institute of Justice; 810 7th St NW; Washington DC 20531 USA; winnie@ojp.usdoj.gov
Reich, Stephanie [384] Vanderbilt University; Center for Mental Health Policy; 1207 18th Ave South; Nashville TN 37212 USA; reichs@attglobal.net
Reichardt, Chip [403] University of Denver; Dept of Psychology; 2155 S Race; Denver CO 80208 USA; creichar@du.edu
Reichert, Paul A [606] University of Illinois at Chicago; College of Nursing (MC 802); 845 S Damen Ave; Chicago IL 60612 USA; paulr@ucc.edu
Reinhart, George [395] National Research Council; 500 Filth St NW; Washington DC 20001 USA; greinhar@nas.edu
Reinharz, Daniel [745] Universite Laval; Pavillon de l'Est; 2180 chemin Ste-Foy; Sainte-Foy QC G1K 7P4 CANADA; daniel.reinharz@msp.ulaval.ca
Reinke, Derek R [701] Utah State University; UMC - 2810; Logan UT 84322-2810 USA; jrenke@cc.usu.edu
Reis, Tom [559] WK Kellogg Foundation; One Michigan Ave E; Battle Creek MI 49017-4058 USA; tkr@wkff.org
Reisman, Jane L [600 763] The Evaluation Forum; 1932 First Ave Ste 408; Seattle WA 98101 USA; janer1231@aol.com
Reisner, Elizabeth R [115] Policy Studies Associates; 1718 Connecticut Ave NW Ste 400; Washington DC 20009 USA; reisner@polycstudies.com
Rempert, Tania A [357 418 433 593 755] 18100 S Rita Rd; Tinley Park IL 60477 USA; rempert@msn.com
Renger, Ralph [433] 6161 E Pima St #2096; Tucson AZ 85712 USA; jessrenger@cox.net
Rennekamp, Roger [388] University of Kentucky; Program Development and Evaluation; 203 Scovell Hall; Lexington KY 40546 USA; rennekam@ca.uky.edu
Rhodes, John W [433] Georgia Southwestern State University; 800 Wheatley St; Americus GA 31709-4279 USA; jw@canes.gsw.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Address/Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice, Christopher</td>
<td>Florida International University; School of Social Work, College of Health &amp; Urban Affairs; 11200 SW 8th St; Miami FL 33199 USA; <a href="mailto:ricec@fiu.edu">ricec@fiu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard, Robert F</td>
<td>561 Louisiana State University AgCenter; PO Box 25100; Baton Rouge LA 70894 USA; <a href="mailto:rrichard@agtcr.lsu.edu">rrichard@agtcr.lsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards-Schuster, K</td>
<td>107 University of Michigan; School of Social Work; 1080 S University; Ann Arbor MI 48109 USA; <a href="mailto:kers@umich.edu">kers@umich.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richburg-Hayes, Lashawn</td>
<td>316 Manpower Demonstration Research Corp; 16 East 34th St; New York NY 10016 USA; <a href="mailto:lashawn.richburg-hayes@mdorc.org">lashawn.richburg-hayes@mdorc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricciardi, William</td>
<td>Alverno College; Office of Educational Research and Evaluation; PO Box 343922; Milwaukee WI 53234-3922 USA; <a href="mailto:william.rickards@alverno.edu">william.rickards@alverno.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedel, James</td>
<td>390 Girl Scouts of the USA; Research Dept; 420 Fifth Ave 13th Fl; New York NY 10018-0279 USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincones-Gomez, Rigo</td>
<td>388 603 Western Michigan University; Dept of Educational Studies; 3506 Sangren Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008 USA; <a href="mailto:x98rdorigue7@wmich.edu">x98rdorigue7@wmich.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rios, Pamela</td>
<td>364 Maryland State Dept of Education; 200 West Baltimore St; Baltimore MD 21205 USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risley, John</td>
<td>573 Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008-5237 USA; <a href="mailto:john.risley@wmich.edu">john.risley@wmich.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rist, Ray C</td>
<td>325 562 The World Bank; Operations Evaluation Dept; 1818 H St NW MS H3-305; Washington DC 20433 USA; <a href="mailto:rrist@worldbank.org">rrist@worldbank.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera, Noelle V</td>
<td>357 433 Los Angeles Unified School District; Program Evaluation and Research Branch; 450 N Grand Ave Rm A-427; Los Angeles CA 90012 USA; <a href="mailto:nrive3@lausd.k12.ca.us">nrive3@lausd.k12.ca.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins, David</td>
<td>575 Center for Substance Abuse Prevention; Office of Evaluation Scientific Analysis and Synthesis; 5600 Fishers Ln 5600 Rockwall II; Rockville MD 20857 USA; <a href="mailto:drobbins@samhsa.gov">drobbins@samhsa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins, Scott A</td>
<td>339 363 1 Verano Ct; Santa Fe NM 87508 USA; <a href="mailto:srobbins@lanl.gov">srobbins@lanl.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Christine</td>
<td>580 RDA/DSHS; PO Box 45204; Olympia WA 95204-5204 USA; <a href="mailto:chrisrobb11@hotmail.com">chrisrobb11@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Greg J</td>
<td>369 393 721 The University of Texas at Austin; Center for Health Promotion Research in Underserved Populations; 1700 Red River (D0100); Austin TX 78701-1499 USA; <a href="mailto:gregroberts@mail.utexas.edu">gregroberts@mail.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins, Paula J</td>
<td>321 PO Box 20355; Kalamazoo MI 49019 USA; <a href="mailto:paula.roberts@wmich.edu">paula.roberts@wmich.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Richard N</td>
<td>620 Utah State University; Early Intervention Research Institute; 6580 Old Main Hill; Logan UT 84322-6580 USA; <a href="mailto:richr@cpd2.usu.edu">richr@cpd2.usu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson-Rehberg, Eileen A</td>
<td>381 Resource Network; 3002 Ave O 1/2; Austin TX 78701-1499 USA; <a href="mailto:eileenrehberg@rehberg.net">eileenrehberg@rehberg.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Catherine</td>
<td>381 American Red Cross; 431 18th St NW 2nd Fl; Washington DC 20006-5304 USA; <a href="mailto:robinsc@usa.redcross.org">robinsc@usa.redcross.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Paulette</td>
<td>335 University of Maryland; CSS 4441; College Park MD 20742 USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Valerie</td>
<td>802 Recovery Services of Warren and Clinton Counties; 210 W Main St; Lebanon OH 45036 USA; <a href="mailto:robinsv@bbh.org">robinsv@bbh.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Yvette R</td>
<td>599 4735 Roswell Rd Apt 1928; Atlanta GA 30342 USA; <a href="mailto:fete@earthlink.net">fete@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocha, Luann</td>
<td>433 El Centro de la Colonia; PO Box 1613; Oxnard CA 93032-1613 USA; <a href="mailto:luannrocha@elcentrito.org">luannrocha@elcentrito.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhill, Anna</td>
<td>548 520 SW Harrison #440; Portland OR 97201 USA; <a href="mailto:rockhilla@cwp.sws.pdx.edu">rockhilla@cwp.sws.pdx.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddy, Pamela</td>
<td>383 Center for Substance Abuse Prevention/DKDE; 5515 Security Ln Ste 1075; Rockville MD 20857 USA; <a href="mailto:prddy@samhsa.gov">prddy@samhsa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez, Carlos</td>
<td>759 American Institutes for Research; 1000 Thomas Jefferson St NW Ste 300; Washington DC 20007-3835 USA; <a href="mailto:CRodriguez@air.org">CRodriguez@air.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez, Eunice</td>
<td>370 Cornell University; Dept of Policy Analysis and Management; 107 MVR Hall; Ithaca NY 14850 USA; <a href="mailto:er23@cornell.edu">er23@cornell.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez-Campos, Liliana</td>
<td>388 603 Western Michigan University; Dept of Educational Studies; 3506 Sangren Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008 USA; <a href="mailto:x98rdorigue7@wmich.edu">x98rdorigue7@wmich.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rog, Debra J</td>
<td>312 384 410 597 797 Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies; 1915 I St NW Ste 600; Washington DC 20006 USA; <a href="mailto:Debra.J.Rog@vanderbilt.edu">Debra.J.Rog@vanderbilt.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Jill</td>
<td>594 Disease Prevention and Control; Jesse Cooper Building; PO Box 637; Dover DE 19903 USA; <a href="mailto:jilrogers@state.de.us">jilrogers@state.de.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Juan</td>
<td>327 Georgia Institute of Technology; Research Value Mapping Program; 201 DM Smith; Atlanta GA 30332-0345 USA; <a href="mailto:jrogers@pickles.iac.gatech.edu">jrogers@pickles.iac.gatech.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Nancy</td>
<td>707 University of Cincinnati; Evaluation Services Center; PO Box 210105; Cincinnati OH 45221-0105 USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Patricia J</td>
<td>109 374 425 566 590 808 Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology; CIRCLE (Collaborative Institute of Research, Consulting and Learning in Evaluation); GPO Box 2467V; Melbourne VIC 3001 AUSTRALIA; <a href="mailto:Patricia.Rogers@rmit.edu.au">Patricia.Rogers@rmit.edu.au</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, Susan J</td>
<td>402 Academy for Educational Development; 100 Fifth Ave 2nd Fl; New York NY 10011 USA; <a href="mailto:srogers@aed.org">srogers@aed.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roget, Nancy A</td>
<td>766 University of Nevada at Reno; Mountain West ATTC/279; Reno NV 89557 USA; <a href="mailto:roget@unr.edu">roget@unr.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman, John</td>
<td>588 The Urban Institute; 2100 M St NW; Washington DC 20002 USA; <a href="mailto:jroman@ui.urban.org">jroman@ui.urban.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roo, Magdalena</td>
<td>536 603 1108 S 1st St; Austin TX 78704 USA; <a href="mailto:mrood@jump.net">mrood@jump.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roesaen, Cheryl</td>
<td>407 Michigan State University; 116D Erickson Hall; East Lansing MI 48824 USA; <a href="mailto:crosaen@msu.edu">crosaen@msu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosas, Scott</td>
<td>344 1825 Faulkland Rd; Wilmington DE 19805 USA; <a href="mailto:srosas@state.de.us">srosas@state.de.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rose, Martha [722] Johnson & Wales University; Graduate School; Providence RI 02903 USA; mrose@jwu.edu
Rosenbaum, Nancy [536] National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship; 120 Wall St 29th Fl; New York NY 11215 USA; nancyr@ntfe.com
Rosenblatt, Abram [433 761] University of California San Francisco - Child Services Research Group; Dept of Psychiatry; 1388 Sutter St Ste 503; San Francisco CA 94109 USA
Rosenstein, Barbara [568] National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship; 120 Wall St 29th Fl; New York NY 11215 USA; nancyr@ntfe.com
Rosenblatt, Abram [433 761] University of California San Francisco - Child Services Research Group; Dept of Psychiatry; 1388 Sutter St Ste 503; San Francisco CA 94109 USA
Roth, Jane [555 622] US Dept of Agriculture Office of Policy, Program Development, and Evaluation; Food Safety and Inspection Service; 1400 Independence Ave SW - South Bldg Rm 383; Washington DC 20250 USA; Roth@fsis.usda.gov
Roufosse, Caroline [517 746] ISE sprl; Intelligence & Strategy for the Environment; 60 Culee St; Waterloo B-1410 BELGIUM; H_Masson@hotmail.com
Rowald, Laura A [602 785] Southern Illinois University; Dept of Psychology; Life Science II Rm 281; Carbondale IL 62901-6502 USA; rowald4@midamer.net
Rowe, Andy [547] 2707 Stratford Rd; Columbia SC 29204 USA; ghkint.us@ghkint.com
Rowe, Wendy E [329] 4918 Columbus Ave; Bellingham WA 98226 USA; wrowe725@aol.com
Rubin, Maureen [599] University Of South Carolina; College of Social Work; Columbia SC 29208 USA; rubinm@gwm.sc.edu
Rudd, Andrew K [625] Indiana University; Indiana Center for Evaluation; 509 E 3rd St; Bloomington IN 47401-3654 USA; arudd@indiana.edu
Rude-Parks, Carolyn [527] University of Louisville, Dept of Leadership, Foundations, and Human Resource Education; College of Education and Human Development; Room 343A; Louisville KY 40292 USA; cparkins@louisville.edu
Ruedt, Danielle E [741] Georgia Abstinence Education; Children and Youth Coordinating Council; 10 Park Place S Ste 410; Atlanta GA 30303 USA; DanielleRuedt@cycc.state.ga.us
Rueli, Terry [402] New York Harm Reduction Educators Incorporated; 903 Dawson St; Bronx NY 10459 USA; truefli@worldnet.att.net
Ruegg, Rosalie T [560] 111 Pinewood Pl; Emerald Isle NC 28594 USA; ruegg@ec.rr.com
Ruffolo, Mary [596] University of Michigan; School of Social Work; 1080 S University 2726; Ann Arbor MI 48109-1106 USA; mruffolo@umich.edu
Rugh, Jim [114 581 719] CARE; 151 Ellis St; Atlanta GA 30303-2440 USA; rugh@care.org
Ruh, Kari [370] Northern Illinois University; 81 Johnson Ct; Palo Alto CA 94301 USA; zmresearch@aol.com
Russ-Eft, Darlene [433] 809 Lincoln Ave; Palo Alto CA 94301 USA; zmresearch@aol.com
Russ-Eft, Darlene [433] 809 Lincoln Ave; Palo Alto CA 94301 USA; zmresearch@aol.com
Russ-Eft, Darlene [433] 809 Lincoln Ave; Palo Alto CA 94301 USA; zmresearch@aol.com
Ryan, Katherine [354 355 704] University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; College of Education 210e Education Bldg; 1310 S Sixth St; Champaign IL 61820 USA; k-ryan6@uiuc.edu

SSSSSSSS
Sabio, Kim [736] 424 West 49th St 3A; New York NY 10019 USA; kimsabo@aol.com
Sacks, JoAnn Y [410] 71 W 23rd St 8th Fl; New York NY 10010 USA; jsacks@hotmail.com
Sacks, Stanely [410] 71 W 23rd St 8th Fl; New York NY 10010 USA; s-jsacks@ix.netcom.com
Sanchez Suet, Emma [105] 199 Park Dr Apt 115; Boston MA 02215 USA; esanchez@hsph.harvard.edu
Sandahl, Rolf [433] Swedish National Financial Management Authority; PO Box 45316; Stockholm 104 30 SWEDEN; roll.sandahl@esv.gov
Sandell, Elizabeth J [539] University of Minnesota; College of Human Ecology; 376 McNeal Hall; St Paul MN 55108 USA; ESandell@che.umn.edu
Sanders, James [330 372 424 577 591] Western Michigan University; The Evaluation Center; 401 B Ellsworth Hall; Kalamazoo MI 49008 USA; james.sanders@wmich.edu
Sandoval, Pamela A [395] Indiana University Northwest; School of Education; 3400 Broadway; Gary IN 46408 USA; psand@iun.edu
Sansone, Frank A [316] Indiana University Northwest; School of Education; 3400 Broadway; Gary IN 46408 USA; psand@iun.edu
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Sarri, Rosemary [596] University of Michigan; Institute for Social Research; 426 Thompson; Ann Arbor MI 48106-1248 USA; rsarri@umich.edu

Sass, James S [113 357 608 710] Los Angeles Unified School District; Program Evaluation and Research Branch; 450 N Grand Ave Rm A-427; Los Angeles CA 90012 USA; jsass@lausd.k12.ca.us

Saunders, Kevin P [611 920 43rd St; Des Moines IA 50312 USA; saunders@iastate.edu

Saunders, Robert [811] Vanderbilt University; Dept of Human and Organizational Development; Box 90 Peabody College; Nashville TN 37203 USA; robert.c.saunders@vanderbilt.edu

Savidge, Mildred E [581] University of New England College of Osteopathic Medicine (UNE COM); 11 Hills Beach Rd; Biddeford ME 04005 USA; msavidge@une.edu

Schäffner, Monika [713] 1107 Christopher Dr; Bowling Green OH 43402 USA; mschaff@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Scheie, David M [519 780] Rainbow Research Inc; 621 W Lake St; Minneapolis MN 55408 USA; dscheie@mtn.org

Schlegel, Sharon L [357] University of Wisconsin - Madison; The Learning Through Evaluation, Adaptation and Dissemination Center; 1900 University Ave; Madison WI 53706 USA

Schmidt, William [333] Michigan State University; College of Education; 453 Erickson Hall; E Lansing MI 48824-1034 USA; bschmidt@msu.edu

Schnaubelt, Thomas [511] University of Southern Mississippi; Box 5083; Hattiesburg MS 34904 USA; Thomas.Schnaubelt@usm.edu

Schneider, Christina [707] University of South Carolina; College of Education; Columbia SC 29208 USA; CSchne5934@aol.com

Schrier, Linda B [622 761] PO Box 85; Floyd FL 32337 USA; lschrader@mailer.fsu.edu

Schwab, Cheryl J [755] PO Box 1351; El Granada CA 94018 USA; cjschwab@uclink.berkeley.edu

Scott, Christy [358] Chestnut Health Systems; Lighthouse Institute; 712 N Wells Ste 300; Chicago IL 60610 USA

Scott, Ellen [316] University of Oregon; Dept of Sociology; 1201 University of Oregon; Eugene OR 97403 USA; escott@darkwing.uoregon.edu

Scott, Elois [323] US Dept of Education; Planning and Evaluation Service Rm 6W 103; 400 Maryland Ave SW; Washington DC 20202 USA; elois.scott@ed.gov

Scott, Marcia [737] Corporation for National and Community Service; Dept of Research and Policy Development; 1201 New York Ave NW; Washington DC 20525 USA; mscott@cnns.gov

Scott-Little, Catherine [556] SERVE; PO Box 5367; Greensboro NC 27435 USA; cscottlitt@serve.org

Scott-Myhre, Hans [575] University of Minnesota; Center for Applied Research and Education Improvement; 159 Pillsbury Dr SE; Minneapolis MN 55455 USA; handsdao@aol.com

Scoville, Satsuki L [388] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; FPG Child Development Institute; 105 Smith Level Rd CB 8180; Chapel Hill NC 27599-8180 USA; scoville@unc.edu

Scriven, Michael [301 331 587 591 614 724] PO Box 69; Point Reyes CA 94937 USA; scriven@aol.com

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us

Seager, Lisa [515] University of Illinois at Chicago; Health Research and Policy Centers; 850 W Jackson Ste 400 - MC 275; Chicago IL 60607 USA; lsear1@uic.edu

Sears, Myrna [340] University of Alberta; Academic Technologies for Learning - University Extension Centre; 8303-112 St; Edmonton AB T6G 2T4 CANADA; myrna.sears@ualberta.ca

Seaward, Tonya [433] University of District of Columbia; Psychology Dept; 4200 Connecticut Ave NW; Washington DC 20008 USA

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us

Seager, Lisa [515] University of Illinois at Chicago; Health Research and Policy Centers; 850 W Jackson Ste 400 - MC 275; Chicago IL 60607 USA; lsear1@uic.edu

Sears, Myrna [340] University of Alberta; Academic Technologies for Learning - University Extension Centre; 8303-112 St; Edmonton AB T6G 2T4 CANADA; myrna.sears@ualberta.ca

Seaward, Tonya [433] University of District of Columbia; Psychology Dept; 4200 Connecticut Ave NW; Washington DC 20008 USA

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us

Seabrook, Lucille [388] Ohio Dept of Education, Policy Research & Analysis; 25 South Front St Mail Stop 708; Columbus OH 43215-4183 USA; lucy.seabrook@ode.state.oh.us
Summerfelt, W Thomas [525] Michigan State University; 129 Psychology Research Bldg; East Lansing MI 48824-1117 USA; summerf6@msu.edu
Sun, Jeff [359] Sun Associates; 100 Foot of John St; Lowell MA 01852 USA; jsun@sun-associates.com
Sundberg, Cheryl [412] University of Alabama; Dept of Educational Research; Box 870232; Tuscaloosa AL 35487 USA; sundbergro@worldnet.att.net
Suskačević, Milijana [320] University of Texas at El Paso; Partnership for Technology in Education; Education Bldg Rm 504; El Paso TX 79968 USA
Sutherland, Stephanie [407] 407-50 Oxton Ave; Toronto ON M5P 1L9 CANADA; ssutherland@oise.utoronto.ca
Suzuki, Marcia [433] Johnson Bassin & Shaw Inc; 8630 Fenton St 12th Fl; Silver Spring MD 20910-3803 USA; msuzuki@jbs1.com
Swindler, Stephanie D [602  628] Southern Illinois University; Applied Research Consultants; Cabondale IL 62901-6502 USA; steph_swindler@yahoo.com
Sy, Francisco [512] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 1600 Clifton Rd NE MS E-59; Atlanta GA 30333 USA; FSy@cdc.gov
Sykes, Dennis J [805] The Ohio State University; Region Vb Head Start Quality Network; 700 Ackerman Rd Ste 440; Columbus OH 43202-1559 USA; Sykes.3@osu.edu
Symonette, Hazel [618  711] University of Wisconsin - Madison; 500 Lincoln Dr; Madison WI 53706 USA; symonette@mail.bascom.wisc.edu
Tackett, Wendy L [553] 47 W Suttons Ridge; Battle Creek MI 49014 USA; wendyolyn@mac.com
Tagle, Laura [743] Via degli Avignonesi 32; Rome 00187 ITALY; laura.tagle@tesoro.it
Takahashi, Lois M [613] University of California Los Angeles; Dept of Urban Planning; Los Angeles CA 90095-1656 USA; takahash@ssprr.ucla.edu
Taku, Michael [536] Global Academy for Development, Education and Research; 1621 Nottinghill Dr; Baton Rouge LA 70810 USA; aetencon@aol.com
Tandon, Darius [545] Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine; 1620 McElderry St 203 Reed Hall; Baltimore MD 21205 USA; standon@jhmi.edu
Taub, Jennifer [617  778] University of Massachusetts Medical School Center for Mental Health Services Research; Dept of Psychiatry; 55 Lake Ave N; Worcester MA 01655 USA; jennifer.taub@umassmed.edu
Taut, Sandy M [568] 1220 N Harper Ave #4; Los Angeles CA 90046 USA; staut@ucla.edu
Taylor, Anna [320  340  750] PO Box 1483; Naples FL 34106 USA; Annataylor5@aol.com
Taylor, Greg [765] North Tower Ste One; 4000 Wisconsin Ave NW; Washington DC 20016 USA; gtaylor@fanniemaefoundation.org
Taylor, Matthew [395] Utah State University; Center for the School of the Future; Logan UT 84322-6505 USA; mtaylor@coe.usu.edu
Taylor, Robert [342] The University of Huddersfield; Centre for Evaluation Studies - School of Human & Health Sciences; Harold Wilson Bldg; Huddersfield HD1 3DH ENGLAND
Taylor-Powell, Ellen [388  427] University of Wisconsin - Madison; 432 N Lake St Rm 609; Madison WI 53706-1498 USA; etaylorp@facstaff.wisc.edu
Teather, George G [366  703] 6441 Sugar Creek Way; Orleans ON K1C 1Y1 CANADA; gteather@sympatico.ca
Tepper, Karen Hoffman [319] University of Arizona; 1110 E S Campus Dr Rm 210; Tucson AZ 85721 USA; karenh@ag.arizona.edu
Terao, Ken [364] Aguirre International; 480 E 4th Ave Unit A; San Mateo CA 94401 USA; ktera@aiweb.com
Tessier, Tony [433] Xerox Corporation; Rts 7 and 659; Leesburg VA 20176 USA; Anthony.Tessier@usa.xerox.com
Theall, Michael [355] 106 White Pine Dr; Springfield IL 62707 USA; theall@springnet1.com
Theilen, Geri [721] University of Cincinnati; Institute for Health Policy and Health Services Research; PO Box 670840; Cincinnati OH 45267-0840 USA; Geri.Theilen@uc.edu
Thiessen Love, Lois [617] 541 S Highland Ave; Oak Park IL 60304-1522 USA; llove@familycareofillinois.org
Thomas, Charles L [306  379  577] 9017 Falls Chapel Way; Potomac MD 20854-2389 USA; cthomas@gmu.edu
Thomas, Edith P [306  577  711] US Dept of Agriculture - Nutrition and Food Security; STOP 2225; 1400 Independence Ave SW; Washington DC 20250-2225 USA; ethomas@reeusa.org
Thompson, Lee [381] Africare; 440 R St NW; Washington DC 20001 USA; Lthompson@africare.org
Thompson, Marnie [731] 712 S Elam Ave; Greensboro NC 27403 USA; mxthompson@ets.org
Thompson, Yvonnda H [347] Dull Knife Memorial College; Box 98; Lame Deer MT 59043 USA; henry@dkmc.cc.mt.us
Thompson-Kean, Julie A [433] Education Development Center Inc; Center for Children and Technology; EDC 96 Morton St 7th Fl; New York NY 10014 USA; jthompson@edc.org
Thompson-Robinson, Melva V [504] Florida A&M University; Institute of Public Health; 207C Science Research Center; Tallahassee FL 32307 USA; melva.robinson@famu.edu
Thorp, Laurie [397] Michigan State University; 65 Agriculture Hall; East Lansing MI 48824 USA; LaurieThorp@attbi.com
Thyer, Bruce [615] Florida State University; School of Social Work; Tallahassee FL 32306-2570 USA; bthyer@mail.fsu.edu
Tiffany, Jennifer S [370] Cornell University Family Life Development Center; College of Human Ecology; MVR Hall; Ithaca NY 14853 USA; jst5@cornell.edu
Tijiboy, Juan Antonio [767] Federal University of Porto Alegre Brazil; Rua Fernandes Vieira 501/03; Porto Alegre RS 90035-091 BRAZIL; tijiboy@onion.ufrgs.br

Tikoo, Minakshi [756] Virginia Dept Of Mental Health Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services; 1220 Bank St Jefferson Bldg; Richmond VA 23219 USA; mtikoo@dmhmrsas.state.va.us

Tillman, Linda [433] Xerox Corporation; Rts 7 and 859; Leesburg VA 20176 USA; linda.tillman@usa.xerox.com

Tingle, Lynne R [322 336] University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Dept of Educational Research Methodology; 215 Curry Building; Greensboro NC 27402 USA; lrtingle@uncg.edu

Tinsley, Nikki [329] US Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Inspector General; 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW #2410; Washington DC 20460 USA; tinsley.nikki@epa.gov

Titcomb, Allison [513 750] LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc; 620 N Country Club Rd Ste B; Tucson AZ 85716 USA; allison@lecroymilligan.com

Tomioka, Ariel [740] c/o Phlliber Research Associates; 8631 Delmar Blvd Ste 006; St. Louis MO 63124 USA; arieltomioka@hotmail.com

Torok, Carol [613] 7278 Lakeview Dr; Ava NY 13303 USA; fctk@sunyit.edu

Torre, L Dee [364] MGT of America Inc; 2123 Centre Pointe Blvd; Tallahassee FL 32308 USA; dee@mgtamer.com

Torres, Jess [433] Office of School Quality; University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Dept of Educational Research Methodology; 215 Curry Building; Greensboro NC 27402 USA; lrtingle@uncg.edu

Trove, L Dee [364] MGT of America Inc; 2123 Centre Pointe Blvd; Tallahassee FL 32308 USA; dee@mgtamer.com

Troth, Mary [724] Texas A&M University; Measurement and Research Services; 4239 TAMU; College Station TX 77843-4239 USA; metroy@tamu.edu

Tschumi, William M [322 328 594 797] Cornell University; Dept of Policy Analysis & Management; 249 MVR Hall; Ithaca NY 14853 USA; wmt1@cornell.edu

Trailer, Karen F [745] Alcohol Research Group; 2000 Hearst Ave; Berkeley CA 94709 USA

Troy, Mark E [724] Texas A&M University; Measurement and Research Services; 4239 TAMU; College Station TX 77843-4239 USA; metroy@tamu.edu

Trowutta, James [108 316] 4897 Breeze Way; Montclair VA 22026 USA; trudeau@rti.org

Tucker, Susan A [311 352 516] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; School of Social Work; 301 Pittsboro St Room 524; Chapel Hill NC 27599-3550 USA; sutucker@concentric.net

Tulloch, Aisha [713 735] 3836 Jackson Shoals Ct; Lawrenceville GA 30044 USA; aisha@bellolli.net

Tulleners-Lesh, Aja [572] Azusa Pacific University; School of Nursing; 901 E Alosta Ave; Azusa CA 91702-7000 USA; alesh@apu.edu

Turk, Norman [745] Alcohol Research Group; 2000 Hearst Ave; Berkeley CA 94709 USA

Turk, Norman [745] Alcohol Research Group; 2000 Hearst Ave; Berkeley CA 94709 USA

Tushnet, Naida [813] WestEd; 4665 Lampson Ave; Los Alamitos CA 90720 USA; ntushne@wested.org

Tyska, Cynthia [603 760] North Central Regional Educational Laboratory; 1120 East Diehl Rd Ste 200; Naperville IL 60563-1486 USA; cynthia.tysk@ncrel.org

Ukaga, Okechukwu M [622] University of Minnesota Extension Service; Cloquet Forestry Center; 175 University Rd; Cloquet MN 55720-9594 USA; ukaga001@umn.edu

Usher, Charles L [406] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; School of Social Work; 301 Pittsboro St Room 524; Chapel Hill NC 27599-3550 USA; lynnue@email.unc.edu

Valdez, Bill [327 366] US Dept of Energy; Office of Science SC-5; 1000 Independence Ave SW; Washington DC 20585 USA; bill.valdez@science.doe.gov

Valdez, Jesse [773] University of Denver College of Education; Dept of Counseling Psychology; 2450 S Vine St; Denver CO 80208 USA; jvaldez@edu.uco.edu

Valley, Rachal [433] RTI International; PO Box 12194; Research Triangle Park NC 27709 USA; jvr@rti.org
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