

September 8, 2006

FUSION CUISINE:
LUNCHEON REFLECTIONS ON THE FUTURE OF EVALUATION IN THE HAWAII-PACIFIC RIM

Lois-ellin Datta*
Datta Analysis

The Glorious but Not Necessarily Placid Past

It is September 1975. Together with about 350 others, we are in a zealously air-conditioned room at the opening session of the first meeting of the Evaluation Research Society. Peter Rossi, Bob Boruch, and Carol Weiss are among those looking ahead to evaluation's future. Only eleven years earlier, in 1964, Senator Robert Kennedy had insisted on inserting into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) language connecting evaluation and empowerment, the link between knowing what children in each school are learning and ownership of that knowledge by parents and community members. This action provided an imperative for and funds to carry out evaluation in the thousands of schools receiving federal aid.

In the years between 1964 and 1975, the evaluation profession came of age. (Evaluation as an activity antedates 1964 considerably. In 1933, for example, Kluckholm and Leighton applied ethnographic methods to evaluate the effectiveness of a program intended to improve economic opportunities for the Navaho.) The first book specifically on evaluation, Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs, by Edward A. Suchman, was published by Russell Sage in 1967, followed by scores of others. Social scientists scrambled to become evaluators, staffing the national impact evaluations of ESEA and other Great Society programs in housing, health, and welfare as well as carrying out the local empowerment requirements. Funding for evaluation soared; evaluation training programs were launched; and, as DeToqueville observed in 1835,

"Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive...If it is proposed to inculcate some truth or foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society. Whenever at the head of some new undertaking you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States, you will be sure to find an association."

By 1975, there were two evaluation organizations. The Evaluation Research Society (ERS) attracted primarily evaluators engaged in national impact evaluations. The Evaluation Network or

E-Net attracted mostly those engaged in local empowerment evaluations in education. These organizations were quickly self-reflective about quality. In 1982, the Evaluation Research Society published evaluation guiding principles in an issue of *New Directions for Program Evaluation* edited by Shadish, Newman, Scheirer and Wye. E-Netters endorsed the standards for educational evaluation developed by Stufflebeam and his colleagues that also were adopted by the American Educational Research Association. The organizations indulged in sporadic collaboration, mild sniping, sharp digs, occasional skirmishes, and some more heated engagements, but in 1980, the tectonic plates ground together, somewhat uneasily, and the American Evaluation Association (AEA) was formed. At this first conference, too, wise men and women, such as Eleanor Chelimsky, Karen Kirkhart, Nick Smith, Lee Seecrest, Yvonna Lincoln, Bob Stake, Ernie House, and Michael Scriven, offered previews of evaluation's future.

Their thoughts, as I recall, were pretty much spot-on in two areas and spot-way-off in one. They were spot-on in discussing advances in theory and methodology, and in recognizing challenges ahead. They were way off in underestimating how swiftly and pervasively evaluation would spread across the globe and infuse hundreds of different fields.

Our Hawaii-Pacific Evaluation Association (H-PEA) joins 29 other affiliates of the American Evaluation Association (AEA), which now has over 2,000 members. And AEA itself has been followed by over 53 national evaluation associations, including our cousins in the Canadian Evaluation Association, in the Australasian Evaluation Association, and in the Aotearoa-New Zealand Evaluation Association, which have sent us warm greetings. At least 30 post-secondary schools in the United States offer advanced degrees in evaluation. Five years ago, the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) was founded. IOCE is thriving with workshops, conferences, task-groups, and training, all in process or soon-to-appear at your local theater. There are now over 500 books on evaluation and about 20 journals in English alone.

So, not the least among these, here we are, together in a fine room, at the first meeting of the Hawaii-Pacific Evaluation Association. We have come from as close as Honolulu, as far as Niihau. We are here thanks to many months of diligent plowing, seeding, fertilizing and watering by many people, including Judith Inazu, the University of Hawaii's Social Science Research Institute, and Dr. Barbara Holthus-Wiecking, our webmaster. To them, and to all the genitors and ancestors of this ohana, our profound mahalo.

Looking Ahead

If we were to look ahead say twenty years, to 2026, what might we see? Will evaluation as

profession continue to flourish and grow? Will H-PEA as an organization be thriving, a respected contributor to the well-being of the Hawaii-Pacific communities and a source of inspiration, fellowship, knowledge, and other benefits to its many members? Further, what might be uniquely ours, as H-PEA? What might be our special contribution, in addition to our worthy and big enough goals of fostering "...a culture of excellence and ethics in evaluation in the Pacific region by improving evaluation practices and methods, increasing evaluation use, promoting evaluation as a profession, and supporting the contribution of evaluation to the generation of theory and knowledge about effective human action?"

It would be lovely, but facile, to predict a glowing future for evaluation, for our H-PEA and for our unique contribution. We hope, but we need also to recognize potential barriers. In the next few minutes, I will consider with you two barriers that have seemed to me particularly pertinent, and will ask you to write down what you see as obstacles, sharing our knowledge. Then I will discuss what I see as particular opportunities for H-PEA to contribute to, as well as take from, evaluation in general: what may be specially ours. And I ask you also to write down what you see we might achieve. Together, we may be wise prophets, and through our shared wisdom help avert the catastrophic and encourage the beneficial. [The responses are transcribed in Appendix 1; they are generally congruent with the ideas in this paper. The ideas are wide-ranging, insightful, and may be of much interest to our H-PEA leadership and to us all. Mahalo!]

Perils for Evaluation in General that Could Affect H-PEA, Too

There are probably several perils for evaluation itself. The one that worries me the most is whether evaluation itself can document empirically that our claims of being beneficial are justified.

Our AEA 2006 President, Mel Mark, chose "The Consequences of Evaluation" as our conference theme. This could be seen as an opportunity to celebrate the good evaluation brings. It could be seen as an opportunity to reflect on consequential validity (in Sam Messick's terms), on evaluation ethics, and on how well we can practice evaluation. And it also can be seen as shining the spotlight on empirical evidence that evaluation in fact achieves the benefits it claims. At least one empirical analysis---of empowerment evaluation---casts doubt or at least uncertainty on the empirical basis for our claims (Miller and Campbell, 2006).

This, it seems to me, may be the most lethal potential torpedo for evaluation as a field. We are not cheap either in direct costs or in opportunity costs. If the fair market value of evaluation time for participating in evaluation could be added to the direct costs, and the fair market value of possible losses because they could have been doing something more worthwhile were included, evaluation could be seen as having a fairly high price tag. It is not unlikely, at some point, that the

Great Voice will speak to us: Gird up now thy loins and answer, if thou canst, empirically, what are the benefits of evaluation?

Evaluation, applied appropriately, undertaken skillfully, and funded adequately need not fear such a challenge. We should be able to demonstrate considerable reduction in uncertainty about programs, policies, and practices; we should be able to show how expanding effective approaches and constraining less effective approaches have saved money and benefited intended users of programs and of evaluation. We should be able to document that the evaluation process in itself can clarify the nexus between what the program intends to achieve and how it expects to get there. Further, we might be able to show concretely that participating in a skillfully undertaken and adequately funded evaluation can build capacity in management and can be in itself a positive teaching and learning exchange.

Evaluation that is undertaken by well-intentioned but poorly trained people, imposed inappropriately, and miserably underfunded and compressed in time is not likely to show many benefits. Such evaluation may be demonstrably harmful, wasting time and saturating decision-making with misleading results.

I worry that due to various circumstances and pressures, evaluation could implode like a pricked balloon. We have been quite aware of these dangers and we have tried to avert them. As a profession, we have tried training for non-evaluators who must undertake evaluations, we have simplified methods and developed approaches such as program logic models, we have prepared toolkits and guidebooks on how to do it, we have described evaluation on a shoe-string, and we have engaged in diligent debate about evaluation methods, frameworks, theories, utility. We have tried to educate funding agencies about the requirements for adequate evaluations, we have developed ethical guidelines that can bolster of interactions with funders, we often have well-trained evaluators in the funding agencies.

If these and other developments are enough, evaluation probably will be alive and flourishing in 2026. If, however, we look at the possibilities and fret, we may need to do more to build a sturdier house.

Perils for H-PEA Itself

Suppose, in 2026, evaluation is thriving. Ipso facto, will H-PEA be thriving too? We are an infant organization. By 20 years of age, many infants have become robust young adults. Some, however, do not survive. Again, there are some mighty requirements for our infant H-PEA's

survival. The one that worries me the most whether we can be of such benefit that current members will re-enroll, new members will be joyously attracted, vibrant leadership sustained, and we will attract institutional and foundation support.

The challenges are many. First is the awesome geographic dispersion that makes travel to workshops and meetings---those engines of value and benefits---terribly expensive in money and time. We may need perhaps to find generous support for many travel fellowships, to support communications, and/or find other meaningful approaches to full participation of all concerned with evaluation across these many miles.

Second, most current professionals are already affiliated satisfactorily with other organizations: health evaluators with the American Public Health Association, perhaps; sociologists with the American Sociological Associations; psychologists with the American Psychological Association; and so on. These organizations are expensive to join, their conferences may have primacy, their journals may offer tenure-rich opportunities, and serving in association leadership may offer high recognition and status. H-PEA will have to compete with these organizations in offering valuable, unique benefits or in appealing to our sense of professional duty.

Third, potential members may be numerous but difficult to locate. For example, we do not yet have a list of all the evaluation-related courses offered even at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, let alone at the many other Hawaii-Pacific educational institutions and departments in which these courses may be embedded or infused. We would need to locate the professors teaching these courses, and cooperatively, reach out to all their students as H-PEA members. Just as urgently, we may need to locate the evaluation training workshops organized by funding agencies such as the United Way and the Hawaii Community Foundation here in Hawaii and the Pacific Islands. Data (Engle, Altschuld, and Kim, 2006) suggest evaluation training may have shifted from academic settings to these and similar workshops. People in our Hawaii-Pacific region might be happy to know H-PEA is *here*, but how do we “get the word” to the dispersed training being given *there*?

And, equally a challenge what activities can H-PEA offer that will be genuinely a benefit and capture the imagination? Specialized workshops on topics of particular interest to our region? A combination of social events during the year with a networking and “state-of-evaluation” conference annually? A strong H-PEA evaluation forum where members can get first-rate and swift answers to their evaluation question, a sort of electronic consultants’hip? Something else?

If H-PEA can meet the challenges of outreach, leadership, and offering worthwhile benefits for relatively little cost, then 2026 should see our infant grown to noble proportions. If not, H-PEA could be an idea whose time we were not able to make come.

Unique Contributions H-PEA Could Make to Evaluation: Proud Peoples, Mixed Plate, Credible Evidence

There are, perhaps, many particular distinctions, each representing challenges to us, yet what we can offer to others. The one that strikes me most compellingly is that by-and-large we are among the world's better examples of harmony in diversity, and equally, a living example of mixed plate. Perfect: no, of course not. But remarkable, yes. H-PEA could be at the forefront of learning how to carry out first-rate evaluations in this context and of showing what we have learned.

Turning to *the proud cultural traditions*, there has been a most marvelous tidal wave of appreciation for scientific traditions such as those underlying Polynesian voyaging, the arts of music, poetry, and dance, traditional practices of conflict resolution, law, and governance, of indigenous sustainable agriculture, and of environmental practices. Kana'iaupunui and her colleagues at PASE, among others, have documented both the diaspora of Hawaiian peoples and the sustained cultural identity. Parallels are found in other Pacific peoples. What are the effects of intermarriage and the diaspora, of the renaissance of self and other recognition, on cultural identity? On the integrity and survival of the proud traditions? And the implications for how, when, where, and by whom evaluations of policies, programs, and practices affecting indigenous peoples are carried out? Many projects of, for, and by indigenous or first peoples are required to have or could benefit from evaluations, and these evaluations should respect and gain from the diversities.

The idea is scarcely new. It has been offered eloquently by Hawaiian sovereignty movements, it has been described with power and eloquence by our cousins in Aotearoa, it is a hallmark of our dispersed Island peoples. There is much to learn from evaluation principles and approaches developed and yet in development by First Peoples. The work on strengths-based evaluation is not only strongly grounded culturally, (Kana'iaupunui, 2005; Kawakami et al., in press) if a haole may say so, but the evaluation implications have been clearly laid out in theory and practice. More theory, more practice, more learning, listening, and exchange could build to a widely recognized and greatly beneficial contribution to evaluation. H-PEA has an opportunity to shine the spotlight on indigenous evaluation in who we are, who are our leaders, what we talk about, what we learn, who speaks with us and to us from programs such as the Hawaiian immersion and charter schools, from programs fully owned by First Peoples.

Perhaps equally important is *the mixed plate* that Hawaii and the Pacific Islands can represent. We are, most of us, hapa: blends of ethnicities, of races, of cultures. We see this in the faces around us; we hear it when ancestry of the Kona Coffee Queen candidates is proudly presented as "Russian, Scottish, Hawaiian, Filipino, and Japanese;" as candidates for political office tell us of their backgrounds. We need to honor mixed plate in our community life, and in our

evaluations. Perhaps few other countries have as magnificent an array of blends living in as much harmony and mutual appreciation as we do. I believe that in the future both cultural pride and ever-increasing blending will characterize many countries. That future is perhaps here, and focusing some energy on developing appropriate evaluation theory and practice for Hawaii's beautiful multiple heritage people could be an almost unique contribution we can make to others. Our work could perhaps start relatively simply, almost ethnographically, perhaps taking our lead from the many fine writers who have expressed their understanding in music, dance, poetry, novels.

Easy to say, not necessarily easy to do. Our courses, training, guidelines, and human resources have to catch up to our ideas. In one example, H-PEA members already are deeply immersed in these issues, at least in principle, perhaps in almost every evaluation we do. The American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators under D, Respect for People, guideline 6, requires us to "understand, respect, and take into account differences among stakeholders." Section E, Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare, charges us under guidelines 1 and 5 to include the full range of stakeholders and to take into account the public interest and good. As noted earlier, guidelines developed by the Maori-Kanaka Maoli Evaluation project (see, for example, PACE Guidelines and Kawakami et al., in press) and those developed by Linda Smith and her colleagues in Aotearoa; the excellent guidelines of the AEA Topical Interest Groups on Cross-Cultural Evaluation, and the work of IOCE (among many others) offer a wealth of ideas, but often at a meta-level of principle that need translation into practice. There is, as far as I can tell, relatively little that speaks as directly to evaluation and mixed heritage peoples, or that adequately discusses mixed plate evaluators, mixed plate evaluands.

What we are learning through our Hawaii-Pacific practical experiences can help other evaluators, and, as we work through the lessons learned from every single evaluation, we can notably help each other. We need, however, to be sure that we practice what we preach in cultural appropriateness and sensitivity. If we were to look at the population of Hawaii-Pacific evaluations undertaken, in process, and/or completed in 2006, in how many would reasonable people judge there is any attention to cultural sensitivities? Appropriate attention? Exemplary attention? Proposals can begin with documenting the diversity of the population to be served, yet by the time the evaluation section is reached, one size fits all. In our evaluation teams, does one size fit all too? We surely have already done much better and need to share these stories.

Credible Evidence: The peoples of the Hawaii-Pacific region share epistemologies and ways of knowing whose richness is increasingly appreciated. At the 2000 American Evaluation Association meeting in Honolulu, Nainoa Thompson enthralled us in his opening address on the re-invigoration of the great Pacific voyages and trans-Pacific navigation. The impact of his presentation is surely farther and wider than we know, but at least two instances may illustrate its

consequences. Michael Quinn Patton, at the 2003 meeting of the Australasian Evaluation Association has used the Polynesian voyaging history both to emphasize systemic, observation-based, complex ways of knowing and as a metaphor for evaluation practice. Patton reports that the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta---some of whose staff attended the Honolulu conference-- has incorporated the navigation-systems approach in some of its studies on how epidemics may spread globally. The muqoi---stories ---of the Hawaiian-Pacific peoples from the many cultures that enrich our islands carry with them lessons in ways of knowing, verifying, and establishing attribution and influence. Learning from these as evaluators, we can not only improve the effectiveness of our own "local" practice, but also mindfully enrich broader evaluation traditions.

For example, program logic models have become a Mauna Loa, if not Mount Everest, paradigm for much evaluation. Requirements for using this model are built into the proposal guidelines for many foundations, government agencies, and non-profit groups (see, for example, the United Way Evaluation Guidelines and Jane Davidson's *Toolkit for Evaluation* .) And a fine model it is too, in its many variants, when applied properly to situations where the intervention is mature, bounded, brief, and where chains of if-thens and influences are linear. Where these conditions do not apply, the value of the model can erode to the point of being misleading. The Evaltalk strands on program logic and its variants are particularly rich in examining the nuances, strengths, and limitations of this popular approach.

Williams, in his postings on Evaltalk, has discussed fairly extensively both systems theories and complex adaptive systems thought. The complex adaptive systems approaches seem particularly congruent with at least some indigenous Pacific Rim epistemology, in emphasizing interconnectedness, the dynamic and ever-changing nature of experience, far-reaching consequences of small acts, unpredictability, and the development of new orders and adaptations.

Do these general systems approaches and complex adaptive systems approaches better fit some, perhaps many, of our evaluation situations? Better fit the deeper structure of our ways of thinking?

In at least one example, the answer surely is "Yes." The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act examines gains in student achievement on a school-by-school basis. The remedies for performance deficiencies are within school changes. Yet in Hawaii, at least, much of what can affect achievement such as availability of textbooks and ability to hire teaching staff are controlled centrally, not locally at the school level. Many decisions are made in centrally, not peripherally by the School-Community-Based Management structures or individual principals. As one instance, the Big Island schools began their year struggling with student pick up and return home, with some children waiting an hour or more, due to delays in the centrally negotiated transportation contract and inability to pay competitive wages to qualified drivers . School is cut short; students, teachers,

parents, and principals are stressed out: a possible root cause of some student academic problems. Are these systems examined in depth as part of the context for NCLB evaluation? No--- and they should be.

As another example, our schools, our welfare systems, health care, environment---almost every area in which evaluation happens---involve not only the focal program but an ever-changing mix of exhausted initiatives, vigorous new priorities, and hopeful emerging ideas. Evaluation rarely documents what else is happening in the program and policy space that could enhance or deter the focal program, yet such information in a systems view is a sine qua non for establishing attribution and understanding what is happening.

There are interesting alignments between what can be seen like particularly Hawaiian-Pacific approaches to knowing and emerging “mainstream” practice. Some are suggested in Table 1.

For example, talking story as a method of documenting experience and results seems to have parallels in recent work on evaluative narratives; traditional emphasis on what is right, pono, good seems to have parallels in approaches such as appreciative inquiry and Brinkerhoff’s success case method. An understanding of the importance of face-time in building trust, and of trust in creating the opportunity to understand-in-depth may have parallels in discussions of deliberative democracy in evaluation and in the complexities of stakeholder involvement. Time is a central concept here, time to build trust, time to listen. Yet evaluation can be practiced on a shoe-string too small, too frayed to permit this time. If we believe in these ways of knowing, we need to have the courage to insist on the time and resources required for practice. Thus, we can learn from developments in the “mainstream” evaluation parallels, but have an unparalleled opportunity to practice multi-epistemological evaluation (there’s gotta be a better word) right in our Pacific area and share what is learned.

Finally, this an election year. It represents a listening and learning time. H-PEA can perhaps do what AEA, despite Scriven’s prodding, has failed to do: *become a visible credible voice for evaluation in legislation*. Do the laws passed by our Hawaii-Pacific legislatures give appropriate attention to evaluation in the form of performance auditing, in the form of other approaches? Could five words be added relevant legislation, such as “Evaluation shall be culturally appropriate?” Could we do a better job in helping legislators understand realistically the costs of doing evaluation---and the costs of not doing evaluation? Could we find ways to track legislation that reaches committee hearing stages and inform our membership so our voices can be heard, individually or collectively? Can we offer incoming legislators some cogent workshops on evaluation, rather as Harvard does for new members of Congress? And incoming administration leaders, too?

Yes, we can. A saying famously attributed to Margaret Mead runs, “Never doubt that a few dedicated people can change the world. It is the only thing that ever does.” And, to adapt to H-

PEA an even more marvelous thought,

“Evaluation demands the open-mindedness with which one must look and listen, must record in astonishment, and most wonder at that which one would not have quite been able to guess.”

There will be no shortage of ideas, our H-PEA is in good hands----yours, ours---and it surely will flourish and grow.

REFERENCES

Brinkerhoff, R. O. *The Success Case Method: Finding Out Quickly What is Working and What's Not*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2003.

DeToqueville, A. *Democracy in America*. Edited by J. P. Moyer and M. Lerner, Harcourt and Row, 1996. Original: 1835.

Engle, M., Altschuld, J. W., and Kim, Y-C. "2002 Survey of Evaluation Preparation Programs: An Update of the 1992 American Evaluation Association Sponsored Study." *American journal of Evaluation*. 2006, 27 (3), 353-359.

Frechtling, J. *The 2002 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*. Arlington, Va.: National Science Foundation, 2002.

Greene, J. C. and Amba, T. A. (Eds.) *Responsive Evaluation*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV92, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1988. For other evaluation checklists, see The Evaluation Center, www.wmich.edu/evalc/checklists/checklistmenu/htm. These files include Constructivist Evaluation Guidelines (Lincoln and Guba, 2001); Utilization Focused Evaluation Checklist (Patton, January 2002), Deliberative Democratic Evaluation Checklist, (House and Howe), Key Evaluation Checklist, (Scriven, June 2006), and Program Evaluation Checklist, long version, (Stufflebeam, 2002).

Kana'iaupuni, S. "Ka'akalai Ku Kanaka: A Call for Strengths-Based Approaches." *Educational Researcher*, 2005, 34 (5) 32-38.

Kawakami, A. J., Aton, K., Cram, F., Lai, M. K., and Porima, A. "Improving the practice of evaluation through indigenous values and methods: Decolonizing evaluation practice--Returning the gaze from Hawai'i and Aoteraroa." In P.R. Brandon and N. L. Smith (Eds.). *Fundamental Issues in Evaluation*. New York, N.Y.: Guildford. In press.

Kerr, S. "First Person, First Peoples: A Journey Through Boundaries." *American Journal of Evaluation*. 2006, 27 (3), 360-370.

Kluckholm, C. and Leighton, D. *The Navaho* (Revised Edition). Washington, D.C.: American Museum of Natural History by arrangement with Harvard University Press. 1962.

Lawrenz, F. and Huffman, D. "Methodological Pluralism: The Gold Standard of STEM Evaluation." in D. Huffman and F. Lawrenz, (Eds.) *Critical issues in STEM Evaluation*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV 109. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

Mertens, D. "Inclusive Evaluation: Implications of Transformative Theory for Evaluation." *American Journal of Evaluation*, 1999, 20 (1), 1-14.

Miller, R. L. and Campbell, C. "Taking Stock of Empowerment Evaluation: An Empirical Review." *American Journal of Evaluation*. 2006. 27 (3) 296-319.

National Science Foundation. *The Cultural Context of Educational Evaluation: The Role of Minority Evaluation Professionals*. Arlington, Va.: NSF, 2000

Pawson, R., and Tilley, N. *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage, 1997.

Preskill, H. and Coghlan, A. T. *Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV 100 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rogers, P. J., Hacsí, T. A., Petrosino, A., and Huebner, T. A. (Eds.) *Program Theory in Evaluation: Challenges and Opportunities*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV 87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Shadish, W., Newman, D., Schreier, M.A., and Wye, C. *Evaluation Standards*. New Directions in Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, L. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. University of Otago Press: Dunedin, NZ. 1999.

Suchman, E. A. *Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action*

Programs. New York: Russell Sage, 1967.

Te Puni Kokiri. *Evaluation for Maori: Guidelines for Government Agencies*. Wellington, NZ (1999)

Thompson, Robinson, M., R. Hopson, and S. SenGupta (Eds.) *In Search of Cultural Competence in Evaluation*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV 102. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Whitmore, E. (ed.) *Understanding and Practicing Program Evaluation*. New Directions for Evaluation, EV 80, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998

APPENDIX I: WHAT WE SEE AS GENERAL OBSTACLES TO EVALUATION, CHALLENGES FOR H-PEA, AND UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS & STRENGTHS OF H-PEA

1 A: GENERAL OBSTACLES TO THE SURVIVAL OF EVALUATION IN 20 YEARS

1. Top-down standardized summative evaluation with no use of the result of the evaluation and no consideration of local context
2. Inadequate resources for evaluation.
3. Conflict between research evaluation and policy making
4. Government funding cuts and decreased priority for evaluation
5. Methodological constipation: getting stuck on only one or a few methods
6. Emphasis on rigorous studies results in so few being able to conduct evaluation, so it becomes part of the academic world solely, and too expensive
7. Lack of realistic funding for evaluation
8. People masquerading as evaluators, doing poor evaluation, resulting in “lawyer-like/used-car salesperson” reputation
9. Lack of awareness of the value of evaluation by policy-makers and program staff
10. Relevance: people need to see how this (evaluation) touches their lives and improves policy or law-making
11. Lack of funding and public support for evaluation
12. Damage done by poor evaluations and high costs: people will lose patience with evaluation
13. Cost damage by poor evaluation, lack of awareness/value to policy-makers, lack of funding and few will be able to do rigorous studies. Too expensive

14. Poor understanding of evaluation and poor understanding of how evaluation can be used.
15. The connotation of evaluation may be negative. Need to change and educate the stakeholders on what evaluation can contribute, which may take a long time.
16. Lack of support for evaluation by program funders. Entropy takes hold and the systems, in spite of evaluation warnings, grind to a halt.
17. Lack of understanding of local needs and cultures
18. Federal initiatives
19. Lack of knowledge of the issues, of language
20. Indecision re the importance of evaluation and the time required.
21. Federal government begins to dictate methods and instruments
22. Evaluation funding is lacking but required; negative reports in the popular media about evaluation (“Oh, they do it but it doesn’t mean anything.”)
23. Too much competition and lack of cooperation among evaluators.
24. Ideology-based practice
25. Torpedo Effect: lack of training for new evaluators
27. Don’t see any major road blocks to evaluation
28. Over-evaluation of programs
29. Honest and fair evaluation that does not merely serve some biased interests of government policies

30. Splintering of agreement on what evaluation is and/or what standards/benchmarks are used in evaluation
31. Lack of communication about the benefits of evaluation
32. NCLB, focusing on test scores
33. Lack of interest in evaluation
34. The fast evolution of schools and their inability to commit to long-term programs
35. Public and political lack of understanding and interests
36. Evaluation in general, if not used well or done well: lack of confidence in its ability to make valued contributions
37. Short-term funding that ends before outcomes take place
38. Lack of legislative support for evaluation results
39. Over-legislation.
40. Lack of funding for evaluation services, discredited nationally.
41. Going through the motions (of evaluation) with no impact on what is evaluated.

1 B: CHALLENGES FOR H--PEA'S SURVIVAL AND SUCCESS

1. Difficulties in communicating across long distances in the Pacific region and burnout among busy volunteers.
2. Lack of usefulness to members
3. Temporal gluttony (trying to do too much in too little time)
4. Too few folks willing to volunteer time to H-PEA
5. Lack of time
6. Apathy within H-PEA
7. Disagreements that mimic national NAEA and sound like academic muscle-flexing as opposed to relevance to members
8. Competition: limited opportunities could promote competition, lack of cooperation among evaluators in the region
9. Lack of participation and interest from evaluation professionals
10. Ownership: who has the vote to make decisions and evaluate. If H-PEA is for the Pacific Area, who are the "owners?" I see very few Hawaiians in the conference---but aren't they the actual owners?
11. Overwhelming interference of external mandates that do not pay heed to what actually helps programs do a good job.
12. Since H-PEA Region covers a vast area, communication may be a problem.
13. Lack of interest again returns and no benefits seen to membership
14. Lack of funding

15. Lack of funding
16. Lack of incoming members
17. Little interest
18. Evaluation taken away from local evaluators
19. Communication among practitioners and competition for funds for evaluation
20. Lack of effective leadership in H-PEA
21. Logistics in the H-PEA region
22. Lowered membership or dissolution of H-PEA
23. Apathy
24. Interest; recognition for membership; retention
25. Inability to accommodate multiple perspectives on evaluation and standards
26. Time constraints of school, jobs, lives, families
27. Funding
28. Lack of personnel to recruit from
29. Distance: too closed of an environment
30. Lack of resources and losing sight of the vision of the members
31. Sustaining membership and engaging leadership

32. Lack of involvement by members
33. People too busy to contribute to the association
34. Too much work for too few organizers: burnout
35. Not hearing all the different voices

1 C: UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS AND STRENGTHS OF H-PEA

1. The indigenous approach from Hawaii, shared with others as an example.
2. Indigenous knowledge; culture; relationships
3. On-going process to share ideas and network, and staying abreast of current issues.
4. Peer-review panel of work within our Hawaii-Pacific system, so as not to become stagnant
5. Bring good evaluation practice to less populated islands/areas
6. Grounded in local context, aim to improve, use evaluation as a tool to understanding and action, not an end on its own
7. Unique geographic situation, consisting of island nations/territories that are spread across a large area
- 8 Pacific wide, multicultural economies, legislatures, social patterns
9. The diverse cultures and languages. We need to honor and draw from all. From stories to epistemologies.
- 10 Lead the way in building cultural competency into evaluation designs and interpretation of results
11. Multi-cultural, multi-site
12. Diversity in H-PEA's region calls for different approaches Opportunity to really visit how West, East, and Islands come together in "science."
- 13 Diversity of practitioners/approaches
14. Focus on relationships between evaluator and subject(s) of evaluation; culturally appropriate methodologies and approaches

15. Educating programs and people what evaluation is and what evaluations can do for a program
16. The potential of evaluation to resolve problems in fragile ecological, political, and social environments like those characterized by Hawaii and the Pacific
17. Diverse culture and programs in H-PEA region
18. Diversity of membership; diversity of opportunities; diversity of contexts
19. More aware of community dynamics

* Keynote presentation, Inaugural Meeting of the Hawaii-Pacific Evaluation Association, Honolulu, Hawaii September 8, 2006. . Special thanks to Morris Lai for his most gracious introduction. Comments, corrections, and changes to this paper are welcomed: Lois-ellin Datta, datta@ilhawaii.net or datta@kona.net