CICE Hiroshima University, Journal of International Cooperation in Education, Vol.4 No.1 (2001)pp.39～52

Evaluation Training in the US: An Overview of Training Options and an Illustrative Training Course

Ross F. Conner
School of Social Ecology
University of California Irvine

Introduction

Evaluation has developed over the past 30 years into a discipline and profession. Although there have been many advances in evaluation approaches, theories, methods and concepts, evaluation training has lagged behind. Although the reasons for this are complex, one important factor is the diversity of approaches and methods that evaluators use (Patton, 1997; Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey, 2000; Weiss, 1999). This ever-changing realities present a challenge to those conducting evaluation training. Evaluation trainers must decide what the core competencies are for a well-trained evaluator, as well as what the additional skills and abilities should be. The professional association for evaluators in the United States, the American Evaluation Association, has considered these issues from time to time but, to date, has not set out a listing of core competencies. The Association has developed principles for evaluators that include "appropriate" training (Shadish, Newman, Scheirer and Wye, 1995a) and is currently supporting efforts to update a directory of evaluation training.

Evaluation training, therefore, is currently very diverse in the United States. This paper provides an overview of the standards and principles for evaluators and, based on these, suggests a beginning framework of evaluation competencies. One evaluation training course is described in detail to exemplify how these competencies can be taught.

Evaluation Standards and Principles

The standards and principles for evaluators that have been developed provide a foundation on which to frame an evaluation training curriculum. In 1994, the Joint Commission on Standards for Education Evaluation released its set of standards (Joint Committee, 1994). These standards were a second revision of "personnel standards" developed in 1988 (Joint Committee, 1988) by people and organizations working in education, psychology and measurement with a specific focus on educational evaluation (Sanders, 1995). The revised standards issued in 1994 involved representatives from 15 organizations, including the American Evaluation Association. The American National Standards Institute, the organization in the US that is the final arbiter of organizational "American national standards", approved these standards in 1994.

There are 30 standards, organized into four general categories. These standards are listed in Figure 1. The standards cover a variety of topics, from those that are focused on the methodology of an evaluation (for example, systematic data control and analysis of quantitative information) to those that are focused

on the process and context of an evaluation (for example, political viability and human interactions). The four general categories are

* Utility: serving the information needs of users
* Feasibility: undertaking practical, politically-sensitive and cost-effective evaluation
* Propriety: conducting evaluation that is legally and ethically sound
* Accuracy: collecting data and reporting results that are technically sound

In 1995, the American Evaluation Association released its "Guiding Principles for Evaluators" (Shadish et al, 1995). This was the culmination of three years of work and discussion by a special task force established by the Association to develop a set of general principles, not a set of specific standards. The task force reviewed the work of others, including that of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, sought input from the AEA membership and consulted others involved in establishing standards and principles. The principles were drafted and then reviewed widely. In their final form, the principles were submitted to the membership of the AEA for endorsement, which was overwhelmingly given. The AEA Board then formally adopted the principles and disseminated them. (See Shadish et al, 1995b, for more details.)

The AEA guiding principles are listed in Figure 2. There are 23 principles, organized into five categories:

* Systematic Inquiry: conducting systematic, data-based evaluations.
* Competence: conducting technically sound evaluation.
* Integrity/Honesty: undertaking evaluation with honesty and candor.
* Respect for People: conducting evaluation and distributing results with attention to the dignity of the stakeholders.
* Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare: attending to the diversity of backgrounds, interests, and values of the stakeholders, including that of the General Public.

The Joint Committee standards and the AEA principles are similar in many ways and touch on many of the same issues. Particularly from a training perspective, these two general sets of standards and principles provide a guide for the development of a beginning, working framework of general core competencies that evaluators should have, if they are to follow the standards and principles. These general core competencies include two categories of skills and abilities. First, evaluators need to be trained in the "science" of evaluation. That is, they need to understand evaluation design, measurement, data analysis, and aspects of objective reporting, among other skills. These aspects are included in the standards generally under "utility" (for example, information scope and selection) and "accuracy" (for example, valid and reliable measurement, systematic data control and objective reporting); and in the principles, they are generally included under "systematic inquiry" (for example, highest appropriate technical standards) and "competence" (for example, possess the education, abilities, skills and experience appropriate for the evaluation).

The second general set of core competencies deal with the "art" of evaluation. A skilled evaluator not only has the technical competencies but also has the seasoned wisdom and experience to know how and when to use these competencies, in addition to a myriad of other issues that affect the planning,

implementation, reporting and conduct of evaluation from start to finish. These aspects are included in all four of the standards' general categories of utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy; and in all five of the principles' general categories of systematic inquiry, competence, integrity/honesty, respect for people, and responsibilities for general and public welfare. Issues of the "art" of evaluation are contained, for example, in the standards on valuational interpretation, political viability, and full, fair reporting; and in the principles related to dealing with misleading evaluative information or conclusions, and to disclosing significant conflicts of interest in any roles or relationships.

Based on the content of the standards and principles, evaluation training is necessary, therefore, both in the science and in the art of evaluation, and, to judge from the frequency of these aspects in the two sets, the training should include at least an equal amount of attention to both aspects. In the sections below, the current evaluation training options in the United States are reviewed, and an evaluation training course is described that focuses on both the art and science of evaluation.

Evaluation Training

Evaluation training in the United States occurs in three main forms: university-based programs and courses, association-based workshops and sessions, and institute-based short-courses. Each of these has a different history and different strengths and limitations.

University-based programs and courses are the most common forms of evaluation training. Over the years, these programs have ranged from a single course on evaluation within a specific discipline (for example, within an education department), to a set of several courses on different aspects of evaluation theory and practice, to a complete series of courses and criteria for a concentration or major in evaluation. The most common type of university-based evaluation training is a single course or a small set of evaluation-related courses; concentrations or majors exclusively in evaluation are very rare and, to the author's knowledge, do not currently exist in the U.S., although they have in the past.

It is difficult to obtain current, comprehensive information about university-based evaluation courses and programs. There have been several directories of evaluation training (Conner, Clay and Hill, 1980; Altschuld and Engle, 1994); the most recent one is currently being updated and expanded. In spite of these attempts to document and describe the evaluation training that exists, it has been difficult to develop an accurate, current listing of all the university-based evaluation training programs. The cause of this is the absence of a certification or accreditation process for these courses or programs and therefore the absence of an agency or organization outside the universities that would be the repository of information about such programs or courses. Consequently, anyone can schedule an evaluation course or set of courses, subject only to the restrictions and oversight that academic courses typically receive within institutions. Because there is no outside organization that maintains information about these courses, it is very challenging to develop a comprehensive listing of university-based training courses and programs in evaluation and therefore impossible to develop a comprehensive picture of university-based evaluation training in the U.S.

The strengths of university-based training courses are the flexibility they allow for different

approaches and content and the access they provide to prospective new trainees. The flexibility of the university-based courses is also a possible limitation. Because there is no standard curriculum for evaluation training in the U.S., an instructor can develop a course that reflects his or her particular biases and interests. The resulting course may or may not cover all of the aspects of evaluation that other evaluators would include and may or may not equip the trainees for evaluation in diverse settings, working with diverse stakeholders, focused on a variety of questions, and requiring different approaches.

Association-based workshops and sessions are the second forms of evaluation training. These half-day or daylong sessions occur prior to or after the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association. The sessions focus on various evaluation topics, generally advanced and specialized topics. The target audience for these sessions is current evaluators, as contrasted to novice evaluators. Strengths of these sessions are their low cost, short duration and their specialized focus, thereby giving some participants the extra knowledge or skills they need in an efficient manner. The short duration is also occasionally a limitation; some evaluation topics, to be well covered, need longer than a half-day or a day of instruction. The quality of instruction also varies and is not closely monitored by the association. Consequently, a participant may or may not acquire the skills or knowledge promised for a session because there are no specified criteria and no verification of achievement. Nonetheless, these sessions have become a regular and accepted part of the annual association meeting, with instructors repeating courses year after year; attendance is generally very high, one indicator that these sessions are clearly filling a need among U.S. evaluators.

Some regional evaluation associations also include training sessions as additions to their conferences, and other associations and professional organizations, which are not exclusively focused on evaluation, also will occasionally have evaluation training workshops or special sessions. In these cases, the sessions are usually introductions to evaluation, featuring a brief overview of evaluation and some of its aspects. The intent is usually to increase general awareness and interest, not to train new evaluators.

The final mode of evaluation training is in special training institutes. The most notable of these is the Evaluators' Institute, a private organization run by a former member of the American Evaluation Association board and endorsed by the Association. The institute holds a week of one-, two- and three-day courses in mid summer in Washington, DC, ranging from introductory classes to more advanced evaluation topics (Evaluators Institute, 2001). The strengths of the Institute are its outreach to evaluators around the U.S. and around the world (participants in the last Washington Institute came from 16 countries outside the U.S.), its careful selection of faculty, its serious evaluation of its courses, and its continual scanning of the evaluation profession and arena for emerging topics of interest and areas of need, both nationally and internationally. Its limitations are its sessions' short duration, at least for some evaluation topics, and its relatively higher cost, compared to the Association-tied training. The Institute is clearly filling a niche and a need; it recently expanded to a second week of training sessions held mid-winter in San Francisco.

An Example of a University-Based Evaluation Training Course

To illustrate the form and content of one training course, a university-based evaluation class is described here. This also provides an opportunity to flesh out a working framework of evaluation competencies, using the general areas of "evaluation science" and "evaluation art." The course described below exemplifies what the "science" of evaluation and the "art" of evaluation could include.

This course, entitled "Program Evaluation," is taught at a large public university, the University of California at Irvine, in the School of Social Ecology, a large interdisciplinary school that integrates behavioral, environmental, legal and community health perspectives. Faculty and students in the School of Social Ecology take a "multidisciplinary and multilevel approach [to understanding the analysis and resolution of problems affecting regional and global communities] from a wide range of perspectives, including individual behavior and motivation, social influence, organizational and community dynamics, and policy initiatives enacted at state, regional, and international levels" (Social Ecology, 2001).

Students in the evaluation course are advanced graduate students who typically have had other courses in general social science research design and in statistical methods and analysis; many students, in addition, have had courses in attitude measurement, qualitative methods and policy analysis. The students also have had some experiences working on projects outside the university.

The goals of this 10-week course are

* to introduce students to major evaluation theories, concepts and ideas
* to introduce students to a variety of evaluation examples, and
* to have students apply formative and summative evaluation approaches to an actual, on-going social program or process of their choosing.

The course format is structured to foster the accomplishment of the goals set for the class. The class is kept small (with a maximum of 12 students), meets one time a week for three hours, and uses a seminar format with extensive discussion. The first two-thirds of the course focuses on readings and guided class discussions, supplemented with examples of evaluation projects; the final one-third involves presentations of preliminary evaluation plans by each student, with discussion and feedback from the other class members and from the instructor.

A special and very important part of the class format is the class project that each student completes: a complete evaluation plan. Beginning the first day of class, students begin work on this project, through which the students largely learn the "art' of evaluation to supplement the "science" of evaluation skills and abilities that they receive via the readings and the instructor's remarks. Each student secures the agreement from an on-going social program or process to design and produce a complete evaluation plan; importantly, the implementation of the plan is not a requirement for the project, either on the part of the student or the program. Each student works with a different project or process, and they make their own contacts for this assignment, based on their interests and proximity to the program location. Often, community agencies or groups have learned about this assignment, usually through others who, in the past, have had a student from the class successfully and productively work with them. In these cases, the programs request that interested students contact them as a possible site. During a recent offering of the class, students developed evaluation plans for

* a training program for Latina health outreach workers,

* an educational tutoring program for low-income children,
* a program to help senior citizens with behavioral and mental problems,
* a Life Skills curriculum for teenagers diverted from the juvenile justice system,
* a behavioral modification program for severely emotionally-disturbed children, and
* a redevelopment plan for part of a city.

Once program placements have been secured (usually by the second week), each student spends about 8 to10 hours a week with the program for the next six weeks, observing and learning about the program and working with program staff and stakeholders to develop a full, sensitive, realistic evaluation plan. The aim is to develop an evaluation plan that has both formative and summative components, in order to give the students the experience of developing evaluation plans and tools for both of these major types of evaluation. The students are sensitized to the fact that, for the program itself, one of these evaluation focuses may be paramount, in spite of the course requirements for both. When this is the case, the students learn how to explain to the program staff why their evaluation plan includes both components. This has never been a problem with the organizations or agencies, probably because the students are only designing a complete evaluation plan, not carrying out the evaluation.

The evaluation content for the first two-thirds of the course is drawn largely from the text, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey, 1999). Readings and class discussions cover general evaluation terms and models, the context of evaluation, evaluator principles and standards, goals and objectives, evaluability assessment, needs assessment, process monitoring, outcome assessment, cost-benefit/cost-effectiveness (at a cursory introductory level), evaluation budgeting, planning evaluation timelines, evaluation reporting and use. See Figure 3 for an outline of the topics of the weekly meetings, drawn from the class syllabus.

The class readings and instructor's remarks related to them provide the main sources of evaluation knowledge and skills, the "science" of evaluation; these are described in the weekly topics listed in Figure 3. The case examples discussed in class and particularly the students' experiences while developing the evaluation project, as well as their sharing of these, provide the main sources of the aspects of evaluation that are related to the "art" of evaluation. These are harder to summarize but include such as aspects and issues as:

* the weighing of diverse and contradictory stakeholder viewpoints
* the personalities involved in an evaluation setting
* the selection of the best set of evaluation questions, in view of the many realities in an evaluation setting
* the pros and cons of the implementation realities of different evaluation methods and procedures, and
* the politics of evaluation.

The general outline that the students use to prepare their evaluation proposals reflects the synthesis of the science aspects and the art aspects of their training. The outline (see Figure 4) provides the framework for the final evaluation proposals. These proposals contain information about the program and its underlying theory or logic model, a statement of the evaluation questions, a description of the proposed process monitoring and outcome assessment components, along with draft instruments for all of

the measures that are proposed (for example, surveys, interview protocols, focus group question sets, physiological measurements). The proposals also contain a timeline; a full, line-item budget; and a complete application to the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on the Use of Human Subjects. Because this is a critical and required component of every evaluation project conducted under the auspices of the university, the preparation of this part of the proposal provides each student with the opportunity to understand what is involved in an IRB application, as well as to consider the ethical dimensions of the proposed project. This is often the first time students have completed this form, which usually is 10-12 pages in length.

Another "first time" experience for most of the students is the development of a comprehensive evaluation line-item budget. This part of the proposal exercise exposes them to another side of the realities of evaluation and helps them understand that some evaluation approaches are more expensive than others, in terms of staff time and resources. Students are intentionally not given budget constraints so that they can plan the "best" evaluation approaches and methods, then learn what these cost in practice, particularly in terms of personnel costs. Following this, the issue of budget limitations is raised so that the students understand that it is very rare to develop an evaluation proposal without these constraints. In some cases, when a student and program want to implement the evaluation plan in subsequent months, the student prepares a supplemental budget. This budget incorporates "in kind" contributed time on the part of the evaluation project's principal investigator (that is, the student) via course credit in lieu of some or all pay. Because evaluation budgets consist mainly of personnel costs, this type of in-kind contribution usually results in a significant budget reduction. Having calculated the cost of his time in the initial budget proposal, however, the student is now more aware of the value of his expertise and contributions.

In sum, the content and format of the course are intended to educate the students in the science and the art of evaluation, that is, in developing their evaluation knowledge and skills as well as their evaluation sensitivities and sensibilities. At the end of the course, the best students are equipped to conduct basic evaluation projects on their own, including the one they have developed if they and the program are interested. Although the students are not fully skilled in all evaluation approaches and techniques and not fully sensitized to all evaluation issues, past experience has demonstrated that they are familiar enough with these to be able to undertake evaluations in the field, during which they will continue to deepen and broaden their understanding of evaluation. An advanced evaluation course is also occasionally offered for those students who want to increase their evaluation knowledge and skills, and there are follow-on opportunities for internships and research assistantships that allow additional learning as students work on specific projects.

This UCIrvine course has several limitations. Because the course must conform to the university's 10-week term, there is only time to cover a selected set of evaluation concepts and approaches. Students have references to other evaluation sources and are encouraged to consult these, but the other demands on them during the term, including the course requirement to complete a full evaluation proposal, limit their ability realistically to delve into other aspects of evaluation.

The format of the course also imposes limitations on the number of enrollees. Each year, the waitlist

for the class is as long as the official enrollee list, and some students have started to submit a reservation for the class nearly a year before it is officially offered. Unfortunately, the evaluation proposal exercise requires a small number of students to be pedagogically effective. With a limited number of students, the instructor is able to meet with students individually, review students' preliminary evaluation proposal components, and closely review and critique each of the final evaluation proposals, prior to final revisions by the student and submission to the program. A small number of students also permits the development of a collegial, cooperative norm among the students and instructor, such that every class participant is accepted as a trusted colleague and constructive critic and participants feel comfortable sharing their ideas, suggestions, comments and honest opinions.

There is one final limitation, which is in fact more of a caution. Students who participate in the course have already received experience and training that has raised their ability and maturity levels. Novice students would not be ready to undertake the evaluation proposal exercise, and it would be unwise and unfair for an instructor to subject local organizations, agencies and programs to these untrained and unseasoned students. Either prerequisite courses must be put in place or students must be screened in order to be sure that course enrollees are ready for the intensive, demanding experience, first of contacting, working with, and learning from an on-going organization outside the university, then of preparing a realistic evaluation plan for the organization.

Conclusion

The representativeness of the University of California Irvine program evaluation course to all university-based evaluation courses in the U.S. is unknowable because there is no master listing of all university-based evaluation training courses, as discussed above. Consequently, no systematic survey of the form and content of the full set of U.S. evaluation courses is possible. Based on the author's periodic discussions with others who are teaching evaluation courses and curricula, the UCIrvine course seems to be a good reflection of the general content of an intermediate-level evaluation course, taught to graduate students or others with background knowledge in general social science research methods and approaches. The format of the UCIrvine course is more unique, although similar courses often include exercises that touch on some of the same issues as those addressed in the evaluation proposal project.

There is some evaluative data available on the course. At the conclusion, students complete a standardized set of class evaluation questions. In general, the course receives very high marks, in spite of the fact that students also rate the workload as extremely high. Unsolicited comments from former students also have been very positive, as have comments from programs that have served as the focus for some student evaluation proposals. Even a novice evaluator, however, will recognize that these evaluation data are not as representative and systematically collected as one would like. Consequently, the basis for the judgment of the positive effects of the course is more anecdotal than comprehensive.

Evaluation training, whether university-based, association-based or institute-based, is a diverse endeavor in the United States. Until the profession of evaluation develops a set of core competencies, it is likely that the diversity and variety in the content of evaluation training will grow and that the quality

will continue to vary. Some in the evaluation field, the author included, believe that it is possible to specify core competencies for evaluators, using a collaborative and inclusive process that would surface diverse viewpoints, then work via consensus toward the specification of a set of basic competencies. Like the development of evaluation standards and principles, this will not be an easy task or a rapid one, but it is definitely one well worth undertaking.

The importance and relevance of evaluation continues to grow, not only within the U.S., but in other countries as well. Japan is the most recent example of a country that has moved evaluation to a more prominent position. Currently, all programs funded by the Japanese national government require evaluation and some prefectures have similar requirements. The demand for trained Japanese evaluators, therefore, is very large. The importance of evaluation is growing in other regions of the world as well; recently, for example, the African Evaluation Association was formed and is now being institutionalized (African Evaluation Association, 2001). This world-wide increase in the interest in and demand for evaluation is creating much greater need for more evaluators who are well-trained not only in the science and the art of evaluation but also in the culturally-specific realities in which evaluation occurs-an important subset of the art of evaluation.

The field of evaluation, both nationally and internationally, must step up to these opportunities to train more evaluators and do so in a way that builds upon a core set of competencies that are grounded in both the science and the art of evaluation. In setting out such a listing of core competencies, those in the field of evaluation will be taking the first critical step in improving evaluation training. The first set of core competencies will not be the final set; on the contrary, it will be the anchor necessary to create a second, then a third, revised set, through thoughtful and systematical investigation, evaluation, analysis and discussion. Compare this to the step in evaluation when we set out a hypothesis or an evaluation question; we do so to provide an anchor around which we can organize our evaluation and our search for answers. Without this anchor, we do not know where to begin and cannot make progress. Likewise, the field of evaluation needs a first set of core competencies-imperfect and incomplete as they may be-in order progress to a better, more complete set. Around the world, more and more people outside of evaluation are asking for well-trained evaluators; we must rise to this challenge and this opportunity. A larger cadre of good evaluators not only will assure that we maintain evaluation as the important, useful and significant endeavor it is, when well and sensitively done, but also will help us improve its theory and practice.

FIGURE 1:
JOINT COMMITTEE PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS

UTILITY • Audience Identification • Evaluator Credibility • Information Scope and Selection • Valuational Interpretation • Report Clarity • Report Dissemination • Evaluation Impact
FEASIBILITY • Practical Procedures • Political Viability • Cost Effectiveness
PROPRIETY • Service Orientation • Formal Obligations • Rights of Human Subjects • Human Interactions • Full and Fair Reporting • Disclosure of Findings • Conflict of Interest • Fiscal Responsibility
ACCURACY • Object Identification • Context Analysis • Described Purposes and Procedures • Defensible Information Sources • Valid Measurement • Reliable Measurement • Systematic Data Control • Analysis of Quantitative Information • Analysis of Qualitative Information • Justified Conclusions • Objective Reporting • Metaevaluation

FIGURE 2:
AMERICAN EVALUATION ASSOCIATION GUIDING PRINCIPLES

SYSTEMATIC INQUIRY

- Adhere to highest appropriate technical standards.
- Explore with client the shortcomings and strengths of various evaluation questions and methods to answer them.
- Communicate methods accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique the evaluation.

COMPETENCE

- Possess the education, abilities, skills and experience appropriate for the evaluation.
- Practice within the limits of your professional training and competence.
- Seek continually to maintain and improve competencies.

INTEGRITY/HONESTY

- Negotiate honestly with clients and other relevant stakeholders about costs, evaluation tasks, limitations of methods, likely scope of results, and uses of evaluation data.
- Record all changes in the original evaluation project plan and the reasons for these changes.
- Seek to determine, and where appropriate be explicit about, your own, the clients' and other stakeholders' interests concerning the conduct and outcomes of the evaluation.
- Disclose any roles or relationships you have concerning what is being evaluated that might pose a significant conflict of interest with your role as an evaluator.
- Do not misrepresent procedures, data or findings, and prevent or correct any substantial misuses by others, within reasonable limits.
- If you determine that certain procedures or activities seem likely to produce misleading evaluative information or conclusions, communicate your concerns to the client and work to resolve them. If resolution is not achieved and if the misleading evaluation proceeds, you may legitimately decline to conduct the evaluation or take other actions.
- Disclose all sources of financial support of your evaluation and the source of the request for the evaluation, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary.

RESPECT FOR PEOPLE

- Where applicable, abide by current professional ethics and standards regarding risks, harms and burdens that might be engendered to those participating in the evaluation; regarding informed consent for participation; and regarding the need to inform participants about the scope and limits of confidentiality.
- When there are justified negative or critical evaluation results, maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur to clients or stakeholders, provided this will not compromise the integrity of the evaluation findings.
- Conduct the evaluation and communicate its results in a way that clearly respects the dignity and self-worth of all stakeholders, knowing that evaluations often negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders.
- Where feasible, foster the social equity of the evaluation, so that those who give to the evaluation can receive some benefits in return.
- Identify and respect differences among participants, including differences in culture, religion, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation and ethnicity, and be mindful of potential implications of these differences when planning, conducting, analyzing and reporting evaluations.

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR GENERAL AND PUBLIC WELFARE

- When planning and reporting evaluations, consider including important perspectives and interests of the full range of stakeholders in the object being evaluated. When important value perspectives or the views of important groups are omitted, carefully consider the justification for this.
- Consider not only the immediate operations and outcomes of what is being evaluated but also the broad assumptions, implications and potential side effects of it.
- Barring compelling reasons to the contrary, allow all relevant stakeholders to have access to evaluation information and actively disseminate this information to stakeholders if resources allow. Present results as clearly and simply as accuracy allows.
- Maintain a balance between client needs and other needs. When client interests conflict with other interests or with these guiding principles, explicitly identify and discuss the conflicts with the client and relevant stakeholders. Work to resolve these, or, when resolution is not possible, determine whether continued work on the evaluation is advisable.
- Go beyond an analysis of particular stakeholder interests when considering the welfare of society as a whole, in view of the fact that evaluators have obligations that encompass the public interest and good and the fact that the public interest and good are rarely the same as the interests of any particular group, including the client.

Note: These principles are paraphrased and condensed from the official statement (America Evaluation Association Task Force on Guiding Principles for Evaluators,1995).

FIGURE 3:
WEEKLY TOPICS FOR CLASS READINGS AND DISCUSSION IN THE PROGRAM EVALUATION CLASS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE

Week 1	Introduction to Program Evaluation; Approaches to and models for evaluation; Introduction to the class; Discussion of a sample evaluation case
Week 2	The context of evaluation; Differences between evaluators and program implementers; Evaluator principles and standards; Goals and objectives; Sample evaluation case (continued)
Week 3	Evaluability Assessment; Needs Assessment
Week 4	Process Monitoring: designs, measures and analysis; Sample evaluation cases
Week 5	Outcome Assessment: designs, measures and analysis; Sample evaluation cases
Week 6	Measuring Efficiency; Evaluation budgeting; Evaluation timelines; Reporting; Vitae preparation
Week 7	Student presentations of preliminary evaluation plans
Week 8	Student presentations of preliminary evaluation plans
Week 9	Student presentations of preliminary evaluation plans
Week 10	Utilization; Evaluation research as a discipline and profession; Concluding thoughts – next steps and options

FIGURE 4:
OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION PROPOSALS IN THE PROGRAM EVALUATION CLASS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE

	Executive Summary
I	Introduction
II	Program Description a. General description (e.g., mission, general goals, objectives, history, size, location, staff, organization) b. Logic model/program theory c. Specific goals and objectives of the program component(s0 to be evaluated; criteria for measuring the program's success in achieving these objectives
III	Evaluation Questions: a. Process b. Outcome
IV	Evaluation Designs and Measures: a. Process b. Outcome
V	Proposed Implementation Timetable
VI	Final Report Outline
VII	Evaluation Budget
IX	Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board Application
	Notes
	Bibliography
	Appendices (including program materials, draft measures, the evaluator's resume, other relevant materials)

References

African Evaluation Association (2001). Information about AfrEA. http://www.geocities.com/afreval

Altschuld, J., and Engle. M. (1994). Directory of Evaluation Training Programs. Washington, DC: American Evaluation Association.

American Evaluation Association Task Force on Guiding Principles for Evaluators (1995). Guiding Principles for Evaluators. Pp. 19-26 in W.R. Shadish, D.L. Newman, M.A. Scheirer, and C. Wye. Guiding Principles for Evaluators. *New Directions for Program Evaluation,* No. 66. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conner, R. F., Clay, T., and Hill, P. (1980). Directory of Evaluation Training. Washington, D. C.: Evaluation Research Society/Pintail Press.

Evaluators' Institute (2001). Description of 2001 Courses and Instructors. http://EvaluatorsInstitute.com

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994). Program Evaluation Standards. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988). Personnel Evaluation Standards. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M.Q. (1997). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rossi, P., Freeman, H., and Lipsey, M. (1999). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. 6th Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sanders, J. (1995). Standards and Principles. Pp. 47-52 in W.R. Shadish, D.L. Newman, M.A. Scheirer, and C. Wye. Guiding Principles for Evaluators. *New Directions for Program Evaluation,* No. 66. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shadish, W.R., Newman, D.L., Scheirer, M.A., and Wye, C. (1995a). Guiding Principles for Evaluators. *New Directions for Program Evaluation,* No. 66. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shadish, W.R., Newman, D.L., Scheirer, M.A., and Wye, C. (1995b). Developing the Guiding Principles. In W.R. Shadish, D.L. Newman, M.A. Scheirer, and C. Wye Guiding Principles for Evaluators. *New Directions for Program Evaluation,* No. 66. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

School of Social Ecology (2001). General Information. http://www.seweb.uci.edu/gise.html

Weiss, C. (1999). Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.