

Preface

This book is an up-to-date, practical rendition of the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) Evaluation Model. The book is intended for use wherever programs are evaluated, including all disciplines and service areas across the world. Intended users include evaluators, administrators, practitioners, professors, students, and community groups. The book offers a well-developed evaluation framework, illustrations of how the model has been applied, practical procedures, evaluation tools, references to relevant computer programs, and aids to teaching the model. Fundamental themes are that evaluations should assist program improvement, provide documentation for program accountability, meaningfully engage stakeholders, draw upon the full range of applicable qualitative and quantitative methods, meet professional standards for evaluations, and be suitable for metaevaluation.

The CIPP Evaluation Model originated in the 1960s as a guide for evaluating programs launched in connection with Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. In contrast to the then prevalent evaluation approaches, the new CIPP Model stressed ongoing evaluation for continuous improvement and accountability; and it provided for assessing not only a program's outcomes but also the needs of targeted beneficiaries plus program plans, costs, and operations. Although the

model was initially tailored to evaluate programs in U.S. schools and colleges, over the years it has been applied in virtually every discipline and service area across the globe. While the model's users have been assisted by a range of pertinent journal articles and book chapters, a full-length book that delineates the model—especially in consideration of its many and varied applications—has been lacking. This book has built on what has been learned from many applications of the CIPP Model and is focused on providing both evaluation specialists and lay users of evaluation with guidance they can use to get the best service from their evaluations.

Coverage

The book's 12 chapters provide background on how and why the CIPP Model was developed; a detailed presentation of the model; an explanation of the key role of an evaluation-oriented leader who can decide what and when to evaluate; detailed presentations on evaluation design, budgeting, and contracting; procedures and tools for collecting, analyzing, and reporting evaluation information; and procedures for conducting standards-based metaevaluations (evaluations of evaluations).

These topics are interspersed with illustrative evaluation cases in such areas as education, housing, and military personnel evaluation. To help guide discrete evaluation tasks, the chapters include many helpful charts, checklists, and references to relevant computer programs. To support its use as a textbook, each chapter concludes with a set of review questions. The Appendix provides detailed information on the model's uses in many fields and different countries. The book is supported by suggested supplementary readings, a detailed glossary, and extensive author and subject indexes.

The Book's Organization

Chapters 1 and 2 provide background information on why and how the model was developed, as well as the detailed, current version of the model. The next nine chapters follow the typical sequence in planning, conducting, and reporting an evaluation. Chapter 12 lays out a standards-based approach to conducting formative and summative metaevaluations. Basically, we advise instructors who teach evaluation courses to have students work through the 12 chapters in the sequence in which the book presents them. Of course, those instructors may teach a workshop or short course should select chapters that are especially responsive to the assessed needs of their students.

All readers of the book can gain an appreciation for the CIPP Model's unique contributions by studying both Chapter 1, on the model's background, and the Appendix, on the model's uses in various disciplines and countries and in a wide range of doctoral dissertations. All readers definitely should study Chapter 2 to gain an in-depth understanding of the model's main concepts and its theoretical, philosophical, and professional underpinnings. Evaluators and their clients may selectively study Chapters 3–11 to obtain guidance for specific evaluation tasks—that is, design, budgeting, contracting, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Those who are charged to evaluate an evaluation will find detailed guidance in Chapter 12.

Students who plan to use the CIPP Model to guide their doctoral dissertation or master's thesis will find the book's Appendix to contain a rich set of information about completed dissertations that used the CIPP Model. In general, the book has been organized to help users grasp and make efficient use of the model's key principles.

Pedagogical Features

We have sought to make the book as understandable and user friendly as possible. Key features in this regard are as follows:

- *Chapter introduction boxes* provide succinct overviews of each chapter's contents.
- *Key terms*, when first introduced, are highlighted in **boldface**, with their definitions appearing in the end-of-book Glossary.
- *Within-chapter boxes* contain comments and references to relevant evaluations to help illustrate the applicability of the preceding content.
- *Computer programs* that provide efficient data analysis tools are referenced in Chapter 10.
- *End-of-chapter review questions* provide readers with both a summary of some of the chapter's most important lessons and a means to test one's mastery of the chapter's content.
- *End-of-chapter suggestions for further reading* offer both evaluators and evaluation students leads to sources of information to enhance their grasp of certain concepts or procedures.

Supplementary Online Materials

The book's product page on The Guilford Press website contains information and tools to support use of the book. In particular, the website houses a highly specific CIPP Evaluation Model Checklist, which provides step-by-step guidance for planning, conducting, and reporting CIPP Model-based evaluations, and a Program Evaluation Metaevaluation Checklist, which provides step-by-step guidance for assessing a program evaluation's design and implementation and, ultimately, for judging its final report.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to C. Deborah Laughton, Senior Editor at The Guilford Press, for her excellent guidance and support throughout the process of writing this book. We also wish to thank Dr. Gary Wegenke (former school district superintendent in Des Moines, Iowa, and

Dean of the Western Michigan College of Education) for his detailed, critical review of a previous draft of the book. We also are grateful to David M. Miller, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Florida; Mina Singh, School of Nursing, York University; and Zandra Gratz, School of Psychology, Kean University,

for their incisive critiques of drafts of the book's first three chapters. Our writing of the book benefited greatly from their highly professional and competent input.

DANIEL L. STUFFLEBEAM
GUILI ZHANG

Copyright © 2017 The Guilford Press

Copyright © 2017 The Guilford Press.

No part of this text may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Purchase this book now: www.guilford.com/p/stufflebeam

Guilford Publications
370 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1200
New York, NY 10001
212-431-9800
800-365-7006
www.guilford.com

CHAPTER 3

.....

A Case Illustrating Application of the CIPP Model to Evaluate a Self-Help Housing Project

“The Spirit of Consuelo: I want to spend my heaven doing good on Earth.”
—CONSUELO ZOBEL ALGER

This chapter illustrates and explains the CIPP Model’s correct, effective application based on an 8-year evaluation of the Consuelo Foundation’s self-help housing project for 75 low-income families in Hawaii. Ultimately, the foundation used the evaluation both to assure the project’s success and to strengthen the foundation’s approach to evaluating other projects in Hawaii and the Philippines. The chapter identifies 11 key ingredients that contributed to the subject evaluation’s effectiveness.

Overview

.....

Evaluation is an essential part of the Consuelo Foundation’s history of developing and delivering effective, values-based services to many poor people and abused and neglected women and children in Hawaii and the Philippines. This chapter describes the Foundation’s use of the CIPP Model to evaluate its flagship project, titled **Ke Aka Ho’ona** (The Spirit of Consuelo).¹

That evaluation, spanning 8 years from 1994 through 2002, assessed the Foundation’s first, major project. It was a self-help housing and **community development** project for low-income families in Hawaii. The 2002 report on that evaluation—by Stufflebeam, Gullickson, and Wingate—is titled *The Spirit of Consuelo:*

An Evaluation of Ke Aka Ho’ona. That report is the exemplar referenced throughout this chapter. Interested persons may obtain and study a copy of the report, which is available from The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan [269-345-3266; <http://wmich.edu/evaluation>].

The remainder of this chapter summarizes the **Ke Aka Ho’ona** project and references the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho’ona to highlight 11 important ingredients of the Foundation’s approach to and use of systematic evaluation. These include evaluation-oriented leadership; grounding project planning and evaluations in explicit values; using professional standards to guide and judge evaluations; employing a planning grant to focus, design, and budget an evaluation; adopting and

applying an explicit, proven approach to evaluation; employing multiple qualitative and quantitative information collection methods; reporting formative and summative findings; budgeting adequately and frugally for evaluation; employing a range of **evaluation expertise**; and using evaluation findings for improvement, **accountability**, and recording and applying lessons learned.

The Ke Aka Ho'ona Project

The Ke Aka Ho'ona project had a number of remarkable features. The project required the husband and wife of each involved family (or sometimes another pair of builders, such as two brothers) to devote 10 hours each Saturday and Sunday over a period of 10 months to building their house. Children were not allowed at the building site, and each family had to arrange for the care of the children during the weekends when parents were away constructing the houses. Accordingly, the families sacrificed time away from their children and worked long hours each week—typically in the hot sun—to obtain the long-range benefits of home ownership. Many of the builders had no prior construction experience, and some were quite out of shape considering the hard physical labor they would experience over the 10-month period. The work they performed in building their own houses was credited in the amount of about \$7,500 of sweat equity against their home mortgage (of about \$50,000); also, their involvement in constructing most parts of their house was deemed important for learning how to keep their homes in good repair. From its outset, the project required all participants to subscribe to covenants and rules for producing and maintaining high-quality houses; keeping properties in good repair; and keeping the community safe and free of violence, drug and alcohol abuse, crime, and domestic abuse. Moreover, the project focused heavily and effectively on the positive growth and development of the community's children and stressed the importance of giving back to help needy people in the larger community outside Ke Aka Ho'ona.

Evaluation Ingredient 1: Evaluation-Oriented Leadership

In 1993, Patti Lyons, president of the **Consuelo Foundation**, invited the Western Michigan University Eval-

uation Center to evaluate the Ke Aka Ho'ona project. Because the Center was conducting a 7-year study of housing rehabilitation for the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (a rehabilitation being carried out by Chicago's Local Initiatives Support Corporation and grass-roots community development corporations throughout Chicago) the Center's staff members were immediately interested to learn about similar work in Hawaii.

Though funded at a level of more than \$10 million, the housing work in Chicago had been an uphill struggle. It was one thing to rehab rundown houses in a slum area, but it was quite another matter to place poor families in the houses and see them succeed in maintaining the houses and also bringing order, safety, and stability to their crime-ridden neighborhoods. Unfortunately, many of Chicago's previously rehabbed houses in disadvantaged neighborhoods had deteriorated and taken on their former blighted status. As expressed by an official of Chicago's South Shore Bank, most inner-city rehab projects were prone to fail, not only because of the crime in the streets, but because the persons placed in the houses lacked employment and employable skills. He observed that without resources for maintaining the properties, families could enjoy the houses for a while, but inevitably they would fail to keep them up. Also, fixing up old houses had little to do with combating the deeper problems of crime, drugs, and poverty. This was especially so when isolated rehabbed houses were interspersed among rundown properties in slum neighborhoods. (It is noteworthy that the Consuelo Foundation's Ke Aka Ho'ona project produced 75 houses on a single 12-acre plot. Like the Chicago project, Ke Aka Ho'ona occurred in an area with high levels of poverty and crime. However, because the houses were concentrated in a single area, the Ke Aka Ho'ona houses became a fenced community that acquired a measure of insularity from the negative influences of the surrounding, problem-filled Waianae Coast environment.)

As The Evaluation Center's leaders considered President Lyons's invitation, they wondered if she and her colleagues had found or would find ways to provide housing for poor people so that over time they would maintain their homes, pay for them, and build a safe, healthy community environment for their families. The Center's staff members were glad to learn that President Lyons wanted answers to the same questions. Moreover, she wanted the evaluation to be built into her foundation's project from its beginning. And, possibly most important, she wanted the project's staff

to make systematic use of evaluation throughout the project to identify and address problems as they arose, assure the project's eventual success, identify particular housing and community development approaches that could succeed for the long term, and record lessons learned that could be used to assure soundness of future efforts.

Throughout The Evaluation Center's experience in evaluating the Ke Aka Ho'ona project, Patty Lyons effectively carried out the role of evaluation-oriented leader. She believed in the importance of obtaining candid, critical evaluation feedback throughout project development and implementation. She stressed the importance of systematic evaluation to the foundation's policymakers and staff members. She and her staff used evaluation throughout the project and beyond for decision making, for examining how the implementation of such decisions worked out in practice, for communicating progress to the foundation's board and other interested parties, and basically for problem solving and accountability. Moreover, she ensured that evaluations of foundation efforts would be grounded in explicit values and keyed to assessing the organization's success in pursuing and fulfilling its mission. Nothing is more important for an evaluation's success than having it commissioned, overseen, and used by evaluation-oriented leaders, such as President Patti Lyons.

Fortunately, a strong commitment to obtaining and using evaluation to ensure the success of the foundation's efforts permeated the entire Consuelo Foundation. Like President Lyons, board members and foundation staff were keenly focused on obtaining and applying lessons from targeted needs assessments and systematic assessments of project plans, processes, and outcomes. It was advantageous that this group of evaluation-oriented leaders was averse to using evaluation as window dressing; instead, they wanted honest feedback—both the bad news and the good—that they could use to set projects on a solid foundation, to guide and strengthen project operations, and ultimately to record lessons learned for future reference. Of course, they welcomed the evaluations' good news about the project's success as well as valuable lessons learned that they could share with other community development groups throughout the United States and across the world. One implication of evaluation-oriented leadership is that evaluation educators should deliver evaluation training to administrators as well as evaluators, through both preservice and in-service education programs.

Evaluation Ingredient 2: Values

The core term in evaluation is *values*. Ideally, evaluations assess enterprises in terms of explicit, defensible values. Such values form the basis for institutional missions, project goals, and project approaches. Unfortunately, many evaluation clients do not stipulate clear values for reference in structuring and evaluating their enterprises. This was not the case with the Consuelo Foundation. From the outset of The Evaluation Center's assignment for evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona, in 1994, it was clear that all Consuelo Foundation efforts were grounded in and were expected to be evaluated against the foundation's core values.

The Consuelo Foundation had been founded in 1988 by its namesake, Mrs. Consuelo Zobel Alger. In defining her vision for the foundation, she stipulated that its mission was, "to operate or support projects in Hawaii and the Philippines that improve the life of disadvantaged children, women, and families." She charged the foundation to especially serve the poorest of the poor and, in its Hawaii work, to give priority to native Hawaiians but also to serve persons of other ethnic backgrounds. She stated, "What matters in life is not great deeds, but great love. St. Therese of the Child Jesus did what I want to do in life . . . to let fall from heaven a shower of roses. My mission will begin after my death. I will spend my heaven doing good on Earth."²

Consistent with Mrs. Alger's mandate, the Consuelo Foundation's quest has been to help establish "communities in Hawaii and the Philippines in which disadvantaged children, women, and families achieve dignity, self-esteem, and self-sufficiency resulting in renewed hope for those who have lost it and hope to those who never had it." Flowing from this vision, the Consuelo Foundation was focused on three overarching project goals:

1. Reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect and improve the quality of life of exploited children.
2. Strengthen families and neighborhoods.
3. Enhance the well-being and status of underprivileged women. (Consuelo Zobel Alger Foundation, 1999)

The Consuelo Foundation adopted a set of eight stated values to guide its work in pursuing the foundation's mission, vision, and goals: spirituality, individual worth, caring and nurturing, participation and reciprocity, prevention, creativity and innovation, teamwork

and collaboration, and Philippine and Hawaii connect- edness (Consuelo Zobel Alger Foundation, 1999).

Consistent with these values, The Evaluation Center evaluators stressed the foundation's holistic approach to serving the underprivileged. It has often been shown that in tackling deep-rooted and systemic social problems, piecemeal and quick-fix approaches have little lasting worth. Terry George, who served as the foundation's chief project officer during the early stages of the Ke Aka Ho'ona project, described the foundation's community development approach as follows:

Our community development approach is comprehensive rather than piecemeal, preventive rather than palliative, and long-term rather than short-term. We also take an assets approach rather than a deficits approach to community building. In other words, we look for what is right in families and communities and seek to deepen that, rather than looking for what is wrong and seeking to treat that. We also believe that communities everywhere contain the talent and potential to solve their own problems if they adhere to common values and if they receive the kind of support they need to strengthen their capacity to work together. Our work, therefore, is in essence the building of capacities: in individuals, in families, and in communities. (George, 2000, p. 118)

Ke Aka Ho'ona initially served working poor families in the project's early increments. All of these families qualified for low-interest mortgages and thus did not represent the poorest of the poor that Consuelo Zobel Alger stipulated in her statement of the foundation's vision. However, in the final increments, the project included very poor families that could not qualify for mortgages but were accepted into the project on a rent-to-own basis. The Evaluation Center's staff judged this overall succession of first serving families with moderate levels of assets for success and subsequently serving higher-risk families to be appropriate and prudent. In our judgment, this new foundation needed to "learn to crawl before it walked," and that is what it did.

As evidenced earlier, in undertaking the evaluation assignment for the Consuelo Foundation, the Evaluation Center's staff found the organization's plans, overall approach, and efforts to be firmly grounded in a clear mission and set of defensible values that stemmed directly from Mrs. Alger's vision. The foundation's values helped the contracted evaluators to focus their collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting of evaluative information in an appropriate way.

Evaluation Ingredient 3: Evaluation Standards

Just as projects should be grounded in explicit, defensible values, project evaluations should be guided by and assessed against professionally defined standards for sound evaluations. Accordingly, the contract for evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona stipulated that the evaluation work would be keyed to the 30 Joint Committee (1994) *Program Evaluation Standards*. These standards are grouped into four categories:

1. *Utility*: The **utility standards** are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users, while also ensuring that the focal project will be thoroughly examined for its quality and impact. The seven utility standards are labeled Stakeholder Identification, Evaluator Credibility, Information Scope and Selection, Values identification, Report Clarity, Report Timeliness and Dissemination, and Evaluation Impact.

2. *Feasibility*: The three feasibility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, viable, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. The labels of these standards are Practical Procedures, Political Viability, and Cost-Effectiveness.

3. *Propriety*: The eight propriety standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results. The labels of these standards are Service Orientation, Formal Agreements, **Rights of Human Subjects**, Human Interactions, Complete and Fair Assessment, Disclosure of Findings, Conflict of Interest, and Fiscal Responsibility.

4. *Accuracy*: The 12 accuracy standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine a project's merit and worth. The Accuracy Standards are labeled Project Documentation, Context Analysis, Described Purposes and Procedures, Defensible Information Sources, Valid Information, Reliable Information, Systematic Information, Analysis of Quantitative Information, Analysis of Qualitative Information, **Justified Conclusions**, Impartial Reporting, and Metaevaluation.

(The 1994 Joint Committee *Program Evaluation Standards* did not break out the Accuracy category's Metaevaluation standard into the separate category of Evaluation Accountability that is found in the 2011 edition of the Joint Committee Project Evaluation Standards. Essentially, the 2011 Standards break out the 1994 edition's Metaevaluation standard into the three **Evaluation Accountability standards** of Evaluation Documentation, **Internal Metaevaluation**, and **External Metaevaluation**.)

The evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona was keyed to meeting the full range of the 1994 Joint Committee *Program Evaluation Standards*. The final evaluation report included the evaluators' documented judgments of whether the completed evaluation met, partially met, or did not meet each of the 30 Joint Committee standards. The evaluators also recommended to President Lyons that the foundation contract with an independent metaevaluator to evaluate the Evaluation Center's final report. Ideally, the foundation would have secured an independent metaevaluation of the evaluation in order to obtain assurance that the Center's conclusions and recommendations were fully justified and worthy of use for decision making and issuing public communications. However, the foundation's president and board deemed such corroborative assessment as unnecessary, based on their confidence in the evaluation's compliance with accepted standards of the evaluation profession.

Evaluation Ingredient 4: Metaevaluation

Unfortunately, in our experience, client groups are reluctant to fund independent metaevaluations. A basic recommendation of this chapter is that in the initial negotiation process the evaluator should strongly advise the client to arrange for and independently fund an external evaluator to conduct an independent metaevaluation of the project evaluation. The most important role for such an external metaevaluator is to deliver a summative metaevaluation report to help the client and other stakeholders judge the relevance and validity of the final evaluation findings. In some projects, it can also be useful to engage the independent metaevaluator to conduct formative metaevaluations throughout the project to help guide the project evaluation and assure its soundness.

Whether or not the client funds an independent metaevaluation, the project evaluator should conduct for-

mativ metaevaluation, keyed to professional standards for evaluations, to guide and continually strengthen the evaluation work, as needed. Ultimately, at the evaluation's end, the project evaluators should append to the final report their attestation of the extent to which the evaluation met each of the standards that guided the evaluation. The evaluator should back up each of these metaevaluation judgments with a statement of the factual basis for the judgment. An appendix to the report titled *The Spirit of Consuelo: An Evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona* referenced throughout this chapter includes a completed Attestation Form that presents The Evaluation Center teams' attestation of the extent to which their evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona ultimately met each of the 30 Joint Committee (1994) program evaluation standards.

As noted earlier, the project evaluator bears clear responsibility for metaevaluation. He or she should:

- Conduct ongoing formative metaevaluation to help assure that all relevant evaluation standards are being met.
- Fully and transparently document the evaluation process and results.
- Cooperate with the external metaevaluator, if one has been appointed, to help meet her or his information needs.
- Append to the final evaluation report an attestation—with justifications—of whether the evaluation met, partially met, or failed to meet each of the relevant metaevaluation standards.

The main points in this section are that the client and evaluator should agree at the outset that the contracted evaluation work will be grounded in professional standards for evaluation. The project evaluator should consistently adhere to the requirements of the standards; fully document the actual evaluation process; and assess her or his evaluation both formatively to guide the evaluation and summatively to assess and report how well the evaluation adhered to the standards. Finally, the client should contract with an external evaluator to conduct at least an independent, summative metaevaluation of the project evaluation and release the summative metaevaluation findings of both the project evaluator and the independent metaevaluator, if one was appointed, to all right-to-know audiences for their review and use.

Evaluation Ingredient 5: Evaluation Planning Grant

Upon being invited to conduct a comprehensive, long-term evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona, The Evaluation Center's director requested and obtained an initial short-term planning grant. This grant enabled him to become acquainted with the project, its beneficiaries and staff, as well as the project's environment before designing, budgeting, and contracting for the long-term evaluation. Such initial planning grants support evaluators, clients, and other stakeholders to develop sound understanding, rapport, and agreements on which to plan and budget the ensuing, often multiyear evaluation work. Nevertheless, having worked out a sound plan and budget to guide the subsequent evaluation work, it remains important to revisit the evaluation plan and budget regularly and revise them as appropriate.

Providing a selected external evaluator with a planning grant is a more prudent way to plan for an evaluation than is the typical **Request for Proposal (RFP)** approach. Whereas the grant approach allows the evaluator, as he or she plans the evaluation, to learn firsthand of stakeholder needs and interests and of a project's context, the relatively sterile RFP approach typically causes the prospective evaluators to guess about important focusing matters and often leads to key assumptions that later prove wrong. What is more, the RFP approach prevents evaluators, at the outset of their planning, from developing a rapport with the project's stakeholders and consulting them in the course of identifying priority questions and intended uses of findings and formulating key evaluation planning decisions. The RFP approach allegedly affords a sponsor the opportunity to consider the relative merits of alternative evaluators and different evaluation plans. But this is not a strong advantage when the competing evaluation contractors draw up their plans in the absence of any meaningful exchange with the project's stakeholders. Of course, in the case of providing a single, selected evaluator with a planning grant, the client should carefully select an evaluator with relevant experience and excellent credentials. Nevertheless, the sponsoring organization can hedge its bet in choosing an evaluator by first only agreeing to an initial, short-term, small planning grant.

A decided advantage of a small **evaluation planning grant** is that both the client and evaluator can terminate their relationship if the evaluation planning project does not culminate in a mutually satisfactory evalua-

tion plan and set of supporting financial agreements. In such an unfortunate circumstance, the "wastes" of client resources and evaluator time are minimal, compared to what could be the case in implementing a defective evaluation plan. Also, the client can use lessons learned from an aborted evaluation planning effort to search out and negotiate better evaluation agreements with a different evaluator.

In securing a preliminary grant for planning the evaluation of the Ke Aka Ho'ona self-help housing project, The Evaluation Center requested and obtained a cost-reimbursable grant of \$12,000. Such grants should be both small and cost-reimbursable, so that only those funds needed to conduct the planning are expended. In the case of the Ke Aka Ho'ona planning effort, The Evaluation Center used only about half of the authorized \$12,000 amount.

Clearly, the recommendation that client groups provide evaluation planning grants has its limits. It reflects the unique circumstance in which the client chooses the evaluator before seeing any proposal. Sometimes, laws or codes require a sponsor to seek and assess multiple evaluation proposals, so that a fair level of competition is offered and possible charges of selecting cronies or friendly critics are dispelled. In addition, the sponsor is thereby able to choose the most cost-effective proposal from an array of proposals. Even in the face of first seeking and assessing multiple proposals, however, the client group should consider the likely merits of subsequently providing the tentatively chosen evaluator with an evaluation planning grant. In such cases, the first round of evaluation proposals should be examined to assess the proposer's track record and qualifications for conducting an evaluation of the type being sought. The subsequent evaluation planning grant should focus on producing a responsive, sound evaluation design, work plan, and budget. However, often the client should retain the option of funding or not funding the follow-up evaluation, depending on the evaluation plan's quality, responsiveness to client needs, and feasibility.

Evaluation Ingredient 6: A Systematic Evaluation Approach

Foundations, school districts, government agencies, and other organizations can benefit substantially by adopting a systematic approach to evaluation. Typically, project evaluations are team efforts. Usually, they also engage a wide range of stakeholders in various aspects

of the evaluation process. Effective involvement of interested and involved parties in obtaining and using evaluation findings requires that they share a common concept of evaluation, including its key terms and guiding standards. Such a shared evaluation approach facilitates efficient communication and cooperation in an evaluation. In adopting a particular evaluation approach, an organization has the enduring advantage of being able to use it repeatedly, which helps the organization's board and staff to learn and embrace a common evaluation language and to cooperate efficiently and effectively in the conduct and use of the organization's evaluations.

Foundations and other organizations may choose from a number of viable, published approaches to evaluation (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).³ The evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona employed the CIPP Evaluation Model (see Chapter 2 and Stufflebeam, 2000a). This model presents a comprehensive approach to assessing *context*, including the nature, extent, and criticality of beneficiaries' needs, relevant assets, and pertinent environmental forces; *inputs*, including the responsiveness and strength of project strategies, work plans, and resources; *process*, including documentation and assessment of project operations; and *product*, including the extent, desirability, and significance of intended and unintended outcomes. To gain additional insights into project outcomes, as seen in Chapter 2 of this book, the product evaluation component may be divided into four parts: (1) impact, regarding the project's reach to the intended beneficiaries; (2) effectiveness, regarding the quality, desirability, and significance of outcomes; (3) sustainability, concerning the project's institutionalization and long-term viability; and (4) transportability, concern-

ing the utility of the project's meritorious features in other settings.

The framework for evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona included proactive and retrospective applications of context, input, process, and product evaluations. Thus, the evaluation would provide ongoing formative evaluation to guide ongoing project operations and an end-of-project summative evaluation to meet project accountability requirements and inform interested parties of the project's assessed value.

Evaluation Ingredient 7: Multiple Data Collection Methods

Multiple methods were used to gather information for each component of the evaluation of the Ke Aka Ho'ona project. Table 3.1 lists the primary methods used. The X's in the matrix's cells indicate which parts of the evaluation model were addressed by which methods. The aim was to address each type of evaluation with at least two data collection methods.

Table 3.2 shows the data collection methods in relationship to project years, with the X's indicating which methods were applied during each project year. Not every method was applied every year. However, at least three methods were employed during each project year. It is noteworthy that the evaluation's collection of pertinent information was reduced by discontinuation of the environmental analysis and project profile procedures about midway into the evaluation, due to the foundation's need to reduce the evaluation's costs.

Each method is characterized and discussed below.

Environmental analysis involved gathering contextual information in the forms of available documents

TABLE 3.1. Data Collection Methods Related to Evaluation Types

Method	Context	Input	Process	Impact	Effectiveness	Sustainability	Transportability
Environmental analysis	X		X				
Project profile		X				X	
Traveling observer			X	X	X	X	
Case studies			X		X	X	
Stakeholder interviews	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Goal-free evaluation			X		X		X
Photographs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 3.2. Data Collection Methods in Relationship to Project Years

Method	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Environmental analysis	X		X						
Project profile	X	X	X	X	X				
Traveling observer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Case studies		X		X			X		
Stakeholder interviews	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Goal-free evaluation			X		X				
Task/reports/feedback workshops	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Synthesis/final report							X	X	X

and data concerning such matters as area economics, population characteristics, related projects and services, and the needs and problems of the targeted population. It also involved interviewing persons in various roles in the area and visiting pertinent projects and services. Individuals interviewed for this aspect of the evaluation included area school teachers and administrators, government officials, Catholic Charities' personnel, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands personnel, local social workers, the local police, and others.

The foundation considered the environmental analysis to be important and useful early in the Ke Aka Ho'ona project, when the foundation was still clarifying the target population and examining its needs relating to Hawaii's economy and social/cultural context. The procedure was discontinued when the foundation experienced serious financial problems, especially in its stockholdings in the Philippines, and needed to cut back the evaluation as well as other foundation efforts. Foundation staff decided that a continuing environmental analysis was not among their high priorities and instructed the evaluators to concentrate on observing and analyzing what was happening at the Ke Aka Ho'ona project site. This change in the evaluation somewhat limited the evaluation's ability to assess the relevance of a Ke Aka Ho'ona approach to Hawaii's evolving economic and social environment.

A **project profile** characterized the project, including its mission, goals, plan, constituents, staff, timetable, resources, progress to date, accomplishments, and recognitions. This was the evaluation's qualitative version of a regularly updated (largely qualitative) database. From the evaluation's beginning, the evaluation team wrote and periodically updated a relatively large

and growing document that profiled the project as it was established and as it evolved. Especially included was commentary concerning which project features remained stable, which ones changed, and what new ones were added. Early in the evaluation, the evaluators prepared the Project Profile report, submitted the draft to the foundation's staff, and discussed it with them. In following years, as the report grew in size, the staff found that they were reading a lot of what they had read before. For subsequent editions, they therefore asked for updates that highlighted the information that had changed or was added, so they could verify its accuracy and clarity. Like the environmental analysis, the project profile procedure was also discontinued during the final 3 years of the evaluation because of the need to cut costs. In the future, it would seem wise to set up and maintain a project profile as a computerized database. Clients could then access and use the profiled information on a need-to-know basis, and the evaluators would be able to maintain an up-to-date profile of an evolving project and draw information from it for their various reports, including the final summative evaluation report.

Traveling observers design and carry out a systematic procedure to monitor and assess both project implementation and project outcomes along the way, while also gathering information from groups and enterprises outside the project area. The traveling observer is a method in that, as in naturalistic inquiry and ethnography, the observer is the instrument of data collection. These observers are referred to as traveling observers when their assignment includes traveling across sites to collect information about the project and its surrounding environment. Observers who con-

duct their work solely at a single project site are called resident researchers. Typically, both types of observers serve as liaisons for evaluation team members who visit the project site periodically. Both traveling observers and resident researchers develop and employ an explicit protocol—called a **Traveling Observer Handbook**—that is tailored to the questions, information needs, and circumstances of the particular evaluation. Over time, three different traveling observers participated in evaluating Ke Aka Ho’ona. These individuals performed the following tasks:

- Conducted interviews with project participants; maintained a newspaper clippings file pertaining to the project or pertinent environmental issues.
- Served as advance persons for preparing the way for the lead investigators to be both efficient and effective during their periodic **site visits**.
- Collected and reviewed documents pertaining to the project.
- Especially helped identify and assess the project’s effects on the project’s children and youth.
- Kept a photographic record of developments at the project site, including especially progress in construction, but also meetings and other interactions among project participants.
- Conducted interviews pertaining to case studies involving selected families in the community.
- Conducted interviews with representatives of various groups throughout the island of Oahu.

An invaluable aspect of the traveling observers’ work was their briefing of the lead evaluators on their arrival in Hawaii to help them become as current as possible with recent issues and events in the project, on the Waianae Coast, and in Hawaii, in general.

The evaluators learned early on that it was not productive to include the traveling observer in the feedback sessions to go over with foundation leaders and staff the findings in the interim, formative evaluation reports. Too often, the presence of the traveling observer in the feedback session resulted in friction, including defensive reactions by both members of the project staff and the traveling observer. Such defensiveness was counterproductive to useful, frank discussions of the findings. The feedback process worked much better in the absence of the traveling observer who had collected and interpreted much of the information being

discussed. In general, evaluators should employ the traveling observer methodology to capture first-hand accounts of project activities and surrounding dynamics and to facilitate the efficient work of the visiting evaluators. However, as a rule of thumb, the evaluators should not engage the traveling observers in helping to brief the project’s director and staff on draft reports and in having frank discussions of the reports.

Case studies were conducted as repeated interviews with a panel of participants over time, followed by a synthesis of their perspectives on the project. Case studies were undertaken in project years 2, 4, and 7. Additional families were added to the panel each year. Originally, the case studies were intended to track the experiences of individual families over time. However, it was deemed that anonymity of the families included in the case studies was essential but could not be guaranteed in such a small, intact community. Therefore, instead of jeopardizing the families’ privacy, the case study focus shifted from individual families to the collective perceptions of the selected families about the project and its impacts on them. Thus, the total Ke Aka Ho’ona project was the case.

Because case study participants were constantly on site and involved in all phases of their community, the evaluation treated them as **key informants**. The lead evaluators informed these key informants that they, rather than the project evaluators, were the experts as to identifying and reporting life and happenings in Ke Aka Ho’ona. The evaluators worked with these key informants as colleagues in the effort to understand and record valuable lessons from the Ke Aka Ho’ona experience. The lead evaluators periodically interviewed the key informants to gain their perspectives on the project’s impacts on the families’ quality of life and relationships; needs of children, the Ke Aka Ho’ona, and Waianae communities; and the extent to which beneficiaries were influenced to help other needy parties, including those outside of the Ke Aka Ho’ona community. A special protocol was used to guide the case study interviews. The project evaluators looked for changes over time in the key informants’ perceptions of the project’s quality and success, particular issues, and how well these issues were being resolved.

Stakeholder interviews were conducted with virtually all the families who built their own houses, the project’s staff members, the outside contractors who provided the house builders with on-the-job training and support, board members and administrators of the foundation, area school teachers and administra-

tors, area merchants, community service personnel in Waianae, and community developers in Honolulu. Interview protocols were tailored to each group of interviewees and used to guide the interviews and later to organize and analyze the information obtained.

The majority of interviews were conducted with the co-builders who built houses in each annual increment of houses. These interviews occurred about 3–6 months after the families moved into their new houses. The interviews acquired information about the builders' perceptions of the community; the process they experienced in building the houses; the nature and quality of the construction and community development outcomes; the project's impacts on their lives and especially those of their children; the extent to which the project was fulfilling the foundation's mission and values; the type and quality of services delivered by the foundation; and matters related to sustaining and improving the Ke Aka Ho'ona community. The protocol that guided the interviews changed only slightly from year to year. The families were highly cooperative and forthcoming in helping the investigators understand the developing project, identify key issues related to project improvement, and assess the project's success in relationship to their family's needs and the broader values-based **vision** for the community that had been projected by the Consuelo Foundation.

Interviews of other parties were interspersed throughout 7 years of the evaluation. Most of these interviews followed set protocols, but others were more informal, especially when unplanned-for opportunities arose to obtain insights from certain knowledgeable parties. Overall, the interview procedure yielded a wealth of information for this evaluation.

Typically, the evaluation's two lead evaluators conducted the interviews over a period of about one hour. One evaluator conducted the interview, while the other took notes and sometimes interjected follow-up questions. This two-person conduct of the interviews was deemed needed because the foundation prohibited the tape recording of interviews. Interviews were scheduled with about 90 minutes between them, so that following an interview the evaluators immediately could write up the interview. This was deemed important to assure that key responses were not forgotten and to merge the notes, recollections, and interpretations of both interviewers.

With regard to the use of interviews in evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona, application of the procedure yielded a great deal of valuable information. However, most of

this information was qualitative, in-depth information. In future evaluations of Ke Aka Ho'ona or similar projects, it would be beneficial for the interview protocols to include both open-ended questions to yield the needed qualitative information and a rating scale to obtain supplementary quantitative information.

Goal-free evaluations were conducted in years 3 and 4. A goal-free evaluation is one that is conducted by a highly competent evaluator who is not knowledgeable of the project being studied. This technique is especially useful for identifying and assessing unexpected project outcomes. The **goal-free evaluators** are told that their study of background information pertaining to the project will not include any information concerning the project's goals. The goal-free evaluator's assignment is to enter the project's site and the surrounding community and find out what the project actually did and achieved. Questions addressed included:

- What positive and negative effects flowed from the project?
- How were these effects judged regarding criteria of merit, such as quality of construction, quality of communication and collaboration within the community, quality of organization and administration, integration into the larger community, giving back to the larger community, and so on?
- How significant were the project's outcomes compared with the assessed needs of the families involved and the needs of the surrounding environment?

Thus, this technique seeks not to determine whether the project achieved what it set out to achieve, but to determine and judge what it actually accomplished. Observed achievements are credited regardless of project goals, and then they are assessed for their significance. Significance is gauged against the participants' assessed needs and those of the surrounding, broader community. A goal-free evaluator gives a project credit for what it did and achieved and how important that was, not necessarily for whether it achieved what it was intended to achieve.

Obtaining a defensible, valuable goal-free evaluation requires several key components. First, the lead evaluator must select a field researcher who is experienced and proficient in constructing a wide range of evaluation tools and in conducting intensive field-based research. The field researcher should also be schooled

and experienced in designing, conducting, and reporting goal-free studies. Sociologists, anthropologists, ethnographers, project evaluators, and investigative journalists are examples of the kind of specialist who might be qualified and chosen to do a goal-free evaluation. Second, an up-to-date needs assessment in the area of the project is required because goal-free findings must be interpreted in terms of their relevance to the assessed needs of targeted beneficiaries. The third essential component of a successful goal-free evaluation is a dedicated search to determine and document what the subject project actually did. The final required component is a product evaluation in the form of a wide-ranging search for project outcomes—both positive and negative (i.e., a comprehensive product evaluation).

In this evaluation, the lead evaluator selected two sociologists with track records of conducting excellent ethnographic studies in the project's geographic area. The contract for their goal-free evaluation services included a requirement that they develop a **goal-free evaluation manual** tailored to guide the explorative inquiry they would conduct; project the kinds of information they would seek and the expected sources of such information; project the type of final report they would produce; and ensure that their evaluation would adhere to the Joint Committee (1994) *Program Evaluation Standards*. These evaluators proved to be highly resourceful in pursuing their assignment and producing unique, highly interesting sets of findings. Especially interesting in their reports were the perspectives of different area groups on what the Ke Aka Ho'ona project was achieving and how it was impacting the larger community. The project's staff and the foundation's leaders found the goal-free evaluation reports to be highly informative and useful and to add unique value to the overall evaluation.

Experience has shown that clients and other project stakeholders are keenly interested in the results of competently conducted and reported goal-free evaluations. They welcome findings that confirm that the project is achieving its goals, and they are receptive to learning about positive outcomes that are outside the project's goals. The last named are often referred to as side effects. Of course, side effects may be either positive or negative. Accordingly, clients and other stakeholders often want to know whether the project produced deleterious side effects, as well as unanticipated positive side effects. The full range of goal-free evaluation findings takes on added meaning when their importance

is gauged in terms of the assessed needs of targeted beneficiaries. A sound, goal-free evaluation report is especially useful to evaluation clients in delivering information on area groups' perceptions of a project's operations, accomplishments, and value. Overall, the goal-free evaluation technique is highly applicable to the evaluation of projects conducted by foundations and other types of organizations.

Photographs were taken throughout the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona. The photos were of planning activities at foundation headquarters; planning, construction, and events at the project site; houses, yards, and the Community Center at the project site; various locations of interest in the Waianae area; project beneficiaries; project staff, project contractors; and officials of the foundation. The photographs were invaluable in revealing and documenting poverty-related conditions in the Waianae area; the start-up, progression, and conclusion of construction at the project site; the participation of beneficiaries, project staff, foundation officials, and contractors; the apparent quality of completed project grounds, houses, and the Community Center; evidence over time of residents' good maintenance of their properties; the involvement of beneficiaries in social services provided by the foundation; and the great joy of the beneficiary adults and their children upon realizing their dream of home ownership. The photographs provided a clear record over time of the project's implementation and accomplishments and were useful in conveying interim feedback to the project's staff and officials of the foundation. The pictures proved invaluable in reprising and reinforcing the verbal messages in the final evaluation report. Significantly, photographs are useful in obtaining, documenting, and reporting findings for each type of evaluation, as seen in Table 3.1.

Clearly, evaluations of a foundation's projects can be greatly enhanced by employing multiple data collection methods. Fortunately, the evaluation discipline provides a rich cornucopia of such methods. Here we have illustrated the use of seven methods that proved especially useful in the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona. Subsequent chapters in this book present and discuss 15 data collection procedures for use in project evaluations: literature review, interviews, traveling observer, resident researcher, site visits, surveys, rating scales, focus groups, hearings, **public forums**, observations, case studies, goal-free evaluations, knowledge tests, and **self-assessment devices**. Foundations and their evaluators should consider these data collection procedures when planning project evaluations.

Evaluation Ingredient 8: Formative and Summative Reports

The CIPP Model, as implemented in the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona, produced and delivered both formative and summative reports. Formative reports were presented periodically during each project year both in face-to-face meetings and more informally via correspondence and telephone calls. Preliminary and final versions of the summative evaluation were provided during the last 3 years in both printed reports and meetings of project staff, board members, and a broader group of stakeholders.

Formative reports presented foundation leaders and staff with periodic feedback keyed to helping them review and strengthen project plans and operations. Each formative report was sent first as a draft to a panel of foundation personnel, including foundation administrators and project staff. Members of the evaluation team subsequently conducted a **feedback workshop** for the panel. Each such workshop was aimed at and organized to achieve two-way feedback. The evaluators briefed the panel on the recent formative findings and oriented them to the evaluation's planned next steps. The panel's role included reacting to the evaluation's report and planned next steps and expressing how they could facilitate future data collection activities. Based on the exchange, the evaluators subsequently finalized and submitted the formative report, updated their data collection plans, and availed themselves of the panel's relevant offers of assistance in collecting additional information. This ongoing process of communication and cooperation between evaluators and project stakeholders greatly supported the evaluation's effectiveness. The process provided a continuing basis for the evaluators to assist project decision making and accountability; it assisted in keeping findings and reports relevant to stakeholder interests and needs; and, in general, it served to keep the evaluation on the foundation's "front burner." Often, during the feedback sessions, focused on draft reports, the client group would use the reported information to formulate decisions relating to project implementation. A 2001 **Feedback Workshop Checklist**, by Gullickson and Stufflebeam, for use in planning and conducting feedback workshops, is available at <http://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists>.

The evaluation's final summative report was largely retrospective. It summarized and appraised what was done and accomplished during the project's first 7 years. To serve the differential needs of different audi-

ences, the final summative report included three main sections.

Section One, titled *Antecedents*, addressed a broad audience of potentially interested organizations and professionals who might have had no previous knowledge of the Consuelo Foundation, the Ke Aka Ho'ona project, or the Waianae Coast of Oahu, and who might have been interested in the details of Ke Aka Ho'ona. This section conveyed factual information about the Consuelo Foundation, the genesis of the Ke Aka Ho'ona project, and the project's political, economic, and geographic context.

Section Two, titled *Project Implementation*, was intended for use by charitable foundations; local, state, and national government agencies; and social workers and community development specialists. This section was directed especially to groups that might be planning to launch housing and community development projects similar to Ke Aka Ho'ona and might be seeking information on how to organize, schedule, staff, fund, and carry out the various required activities. It was assumed that such an audience would be interested in receiving a factual account of the "nuts and bolts" of Ke Aka Ho'ona. This report on project implementation reflected annual observations and data collection and documentation. It described how the Ke Aka Ho'ona project was originated, designed, and operated. The evaluators endeavored to keep the account of project implementation factual and descriptive, while reserving their judgments for Section Three. Section Two conveyed information on the project's implementation, with an overview of the whole project plus detailed, factual descriptions of the recruitment and selection of project participants, home financing and financial support, the construction process, and social services and community development activities.

Section Three, *Project Results*, was intended for use by the evaluation's entire audience. This report focused on the evaluation approach and results. It opened with a description of the employed evaluation approach, including the CIPP Evaluation Model, the main data collection methods, and the schedule of data collection activities and reports. This section was followed with a presentation of findings, including assessments of the project's context, inputs, process, impacts, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability. Basically, this section compared the reached group of beneficiaries with the originally targeted group; assessed the responsiveness, soundness, and feasibility of the project's design and planning process; judged the effi-

ciency and quality of project implementation; assessed the project's effectiveness in meeting beneficiaries' assessed and targeted needs; assessed the project's achievement of its stated goals; identified the project's unintended but beneficial side effects; assessed prospects for the project's long-term viability; and reported on indications of the project's transportability. Section Three also summarized the project's main strengths and weaknesses in regard to addressing the participant families' assessed needs when they entered the project; the pertinent community and individual human needs that the evaluation uncovered during the course of the project; and the Consuelo Foundation's stated values. The report next listed what the evaluators saw as 24 valuable lessons from this evaluation. Finally, the section concluded with a bottom-line assessment, which judged Ke Aka Ho'ona to be highly successful and pointed to areas for improvement.

Each of the three main sections of the final, summative report was followed by a photographic reprise. Included at the end of Section One were pictures of foundation leaders and staff, foundation offices, a map locating the project on the Waianae Coast of Oahu, blighted housing and neighborhoods surrounding the project site, area resource organizations, and close-by pristine beaches and mountains. Notably, these photographs contrasted the area's beauty and its blight.

Images at the end of Section Two included architectural plans, project infrastructure, project staff members, on-site planning activities, project beneficiaries, beneficiaries in the process of constructing their own houses, landscaping taking shape, happy families in front of their new houses, children enjoying their new environment, and a communitywide celebration of what the project had produced.

The pictures at the end of Section Three portrayed a community with attractive houses, impressive yards and stone walls, beautiful flower gardens, well-maintained lawns, exceedingly happy parents and children, an area teacher helping students with their homework in Ke Aka Ho'ona's magnificent community center, and a concluding photograph of Mrs. Consuelo Zobel Alger, under her statement of legacy: "*I want to spend my heaven doing good on Earth.*"²⁴

Readers of the final report said the photographic reprises made the evaluation findings clear, believable, and memorable. In fact, the lead evaluator's colleague, Egon Guba—one of the evaluation field's most productive scholars—observed that he would not have believed the evaluation's claims about the project's suc-

cess had he not seen pictures of the participating families, their performing construction tasks in a very hot setting, the impressive three- and four-bedroom houses they constructed, and the overall, well-cared-for community of 75 houses and an impressive community center. When appropriate, evaluators and their clients can find it very beneficial to supplement their narrative and quantitative accounts with photographs of a project's environment, processes, and observed results.

Evaluation Ingredient 9: Budgeting for Evaluation

Sound evaluation requires adequate funding. Such funding should allow an evaluation to meet the information needs of intended users and adhere to the professional standards of sound evaluation. Moreover, **evaluation budgets** should be commensurate with the expected value of the projected evaluative feedback. An evaluation should be frugal in its requests for and use of resources but should be funded at a level to ensure that the evaluation can fully succeed and ultimately be worth what it cost.

A hallmark of the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona was its frugality. From the beginning, the evaluators and the sponsor agreed that full-cost budgets would be approved, that these would be cost-reimbursable, and that the evaluators would constantly seek ways to cut costs. During one period when the foundation encountered fiscal difficulties following a downturn in the Asian stock markets, the evaluation's director charged for only half of the time he spent directing the project. Also, The Evaluation Center discontinued two of the planned evaluation tasks that the foundation found less important than the others. Additionally, the evaluation team was able to save the foundation substantial money for the evaluation by such means as sharing travel costs with other Center projects being conducted in Hawaii.

The cost-cutting limited the amount of evaluation feedback that could be provided, especially relating to relevant developments and needs in the project's surrounding environment. But, on the whole, the evaluation team believed that the evaluation of the project adequately fulfilled the requirements of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy as defined in the Joint Committee (1994) *Program Evaluation Standards*; the foundation's leaders concurred in this judgment.

While the full-cost budgets negotiated for the seven-year evaluation totaled \$731,027, due to budget cuts and

cost-saving measures, The Evaluation Center actually billed about \$200,000 less than this amount. The important points learned from this evaluation's costs are that (1) initially it is wise to budget for the full cost of the projected evaluation, (2) sometimes an evaluation's scope must be reduced in the face of unanticipated problems (such as the sponsor's unexpected funding difficulties) in order to carry through the evaluation's core aspects without canceling it entirely, (3) evaluators should constantly seek ways to make the evaluation as efficient as possible, and (4) in cutting an evaluation's costs, the evaluator and client should ensure that the evaluation meets the most important needs of intended users and adheres to the requirements of professional standards for evaluations.

These four points are so important that both parties to an evaluation should consider making them part of the basic working agreements, if not the formal contract. At the outset of the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona, The Evaluation Center's team informed the foundation that the evaluation would be designed and conducted to comply with these points so as to assure the project's cost-effectiveness. The foundation's president welcomed this orientation to fiscal responsibility. Both parties followed through in implementing a fiscally responsible and frugal approach to funding the evaluation. At the start of each budget period, the evaluation team was able to proceed with confidence that sufficient funds would be available to complete the agreed-upon tasks. The foundation saved substantial funds from what it had expected to spend. Some of the evaluation tasks and budgets were cut, so that the evaluation could survive some of the foundation's financial difficulties. These cuts limited the scope of evaluation findings. However, most of the intended evaluation work got carried out, and the evaluators and client group ultimately judged the overall evaluation to be useful, richly informative, and, overall, cost-effective.

Evaluation Ingredient 10: Evaluation Expertise

Woody Hayes, the famous Ohio State University football coach, titled one of his books, *You Win with People*, to emphasize that his coaching success was largely due to the talents, dedication, and performance of numerous student athletes, assistant coaches, and others. Similarly, from 1994 to 2002, many persons contributed to the Consuelo Foundation's effective use of evaluation. The foundation's board, staff members, and collabora-

tors applied a wide range of specialized knowledge and skills to the foundation's various evaluation processes in such areas as legal, fiscal, and policy analysis; social work; evaluation of project applicants; and quality assurance in house construction. Participants in the project's various forms of evaluation helped assess a wide range of matters related to starting, planning, budgeting, managing, and assuring the project's success. This point is illustrated below with a few examples.

To acquire guidance for planning their inaugural self-help housing project, President Patti Lyons and selected foundation staff members visited and carefully assessed the experiences and accomplishments of several self-help housing projects in California. Input from the visits sensitized and informed foundation board members and staff members concerning such matters as the influence of a project's environment, the selection of beneficiaries, possible roles of beneficiaries in the construction process, possible house designs, project costs, and many other aspects of a complex, self-help housing and community development project, such as Ke Aka Ho'ona.

In choosing participants for each of the seven annual increments of house construction, foundation staff members and their collaborators systematically assessed applicants' qualifications and prospects for successful participation in the project. The assessment process included a detailed application form, criminal **background checks**, credit checks, and a review of each applicant's employment history. Foundation staff members then made home visits and conducted in-depth interviews with applicants who had passed the initial screening procedure. Next, foundation staff members engaged groups of applicants in focus group exchanges and role playing. Staff identified the most promising candidates, and potential lenders subsequently assessed the remaining applicants for their qualifications to receive a home mortgage. Ultimately, the foundation used all the obtained information to choose families for participation in the subject increment of houses.

In the ongoing construction process, the on-site manager of Ke Aka Ho'ona played a key personnel assessment role. She wrote weekly reports that assessed the performance and emotional state of each participant. These reports provided early identification of participants who were experiencing difficulties in the highly stressful building process. (Such stress was often associated with a mom—who had to work with her husband building the family's house for 20 hours each weekend, over a period of 10 months—being separated

from the family's children.) The weekly reports were subsequently useful in tracking and assessing efforts to address participants' project-related and family-related needs and problems.

The foundation's librarian made valuable contributions to assessing and clarifying policies for Ke Aka Ho'ona. As is common in innovative efforts, project policies emerge in the course of project experiences, brainstorming, and staff deliberations. Sometimes emergent project policies are inadequate. As a project matures, project leaders need to clarify, validate, and record appropriate, consistent policies. Ke Aka Ho'ona's librarian highlighted all statements in the minutes of project meetings that contained relevance to project policies. Over time, her highlighted minutes helped the Ke Aka Ho'ona team to identify, assess, refine, and clarify policies that would guide the project for the long term. The eventual solidification of sound self-help housing project policies, based on the Ke Aka Ho'ona experience, was to prove useful to the foundation later when it planned and conducted similar projects in the Philippines.

Beyond the evaluation contributions of foundation board and staff members, external assessors contributed to all phases of Ke Aka Ho'ona's construction activities. Government inspectors assessed electrical, plumbing, construction, infrastructure, and other aspects of the building process to ensure the quality and safety of the houses and grounds. Also, by contracting the Western Michigan University Evaluation Center, the foundation obtained an external, professional evaluation perspective on the total project.

The foundation used a wide range of evaluation expertise in its quest to mount a sound project and assure and demonstrate its success. No doubt, the involvement of a wide range of project participants, with various forms of specialized evaluation expertise, contributed to the foundation's effective use of evaluation for decision making, accountability, and institutional learning, and to the project's success.

The main missing element in the mosaic of evaluation expertise was a foundation staff member with a specific assignment to lead and coordinate the full range of foundation evaluation activities. Clearly, evaluation plays a crucial role in the Consuelo Foundation's work. If not already in place, the foundation might consider adding a position of coordinator of foundation evaluations.

Such an internal evaluation leader could provide a wide range of services to ensure continuation and fur-

ther development of the foundation's effective use of evaluation. Among these services are providing a coherent, documented framework for foundation evaluation efforts; drafting foundation evaluation policies and procedures; developing an evaluation operations manual; designing evaluations; leading in selecting external evaluators; conducting internal evaluations; providing evaluation reports to the foundation's administrators and board; training existing and new organizational personnel in the foundation's approach to evaluation; maintaining a database to assist foundation evaluations; maintaining an archive of past evaluations, including key lessons learned; representing foundation interests at professional evaluation meetings; and keeping foundation board members and staff members apprised of relevant developments in the evaluation discipline. Quite likely, the Consuelo Foundation and similar organizations could benefit from designing, staffing, and using services for the role of coordinator of foundation evaluations.

Evaluation Ingredient 11: Using Findings for Improvement, Accountability, and Institutional Learning

In accordance with this book's position that evaluation's most important purpose is not to prove but to improve, the main point of evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona or any other social service project is to improve services to beneficiaries. The preferred way to do so is to use evaluative feedback early and continually to assess and strengthen project aims, plans, operations, and outcomes. Another evaluative avenue to improvement, though counterintuitive, is to provide a basis for terminating a hopelessly flawed enterprise so that its resources can be retrieved and applied beneficially.

Fortunately, the leaders and staff of the Consuelo Foundation were predisposed to obtain early evaluative feedback on Ke Aka Ho'ona and other foundation ventures, to use the feedback to uncover and address deficiencies as well as identify project strengths that should be nurtured, and to keep project activities firmly addressed to the foundation's mission and keyed to its values. It was important that the foundation's president and board members kept in contact and were involved with the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona throughout the course of the evaluation. They played a critically important role in helping the evaluators identify the most important evaluation questions, especially during the

process evaluation phase. They critically appraised draft reports. And they used evaluation findings both to make decisions and to keep interested parties informed about the progress of Ke Aka Ho'ona. The foundation's leaders also considered evaluative feedback on Ke Aka Ho'ona, as they planned other projects in Hawaii and in the Philippines.

A critically important aspect of the foundation's use of evaluation for improvement was the employment of *feedback workshops*, as described above in Evaluation Ingredient 7. By meeting regularly with a cross-section of foundation leaders and project staff, the ongoing evaluation was a regular and effective part of the foundation's process of project oversight and decision making. Through these regular exchanges, the evaluators were able to assist project decision making, and the foundation and project personnel were able to help assure that the evaluation addressed their most important questions and needs for evaluative information.

An Example of Evaluative Impact

A poignant example of the impact of interim evaluation reports on project improvement occurred during the project's first increment of house construction. Eight pairs of co-builders were engaged to do the main construction of the eight houses in the increment. At the outset of this process, the project staff conducted a lottery to assign the house to each of the pairs that would be theirs. Subsequently, the project staff instructed the co-builders to work together in building all eight houses. For example, if one pair had special skills in a task such as roofing, that pair would do much of the roofing work on all eight houses. Similarly, the other seven pairs would be assigned certain tasks—such as framing, painting, or digging holes for post-on-pier foundations—associated with constructing all of the houses.

As the collaborative house construction process unfolded, the evaluation revealed some growing problems: uneven quality in the construction of the different houses and growing dissension among the co-builders. In general, some of the co-builders were working hard and carefully on the house that would be theirs but they were not making the same effort on the other houses. Consequently, discord among the co-builders was growing and threatening the project's success.

The evaluators reported the dysfunctional relationship between early assignment of houses to the co-builder pairs, the subsequent uneven effort by pairs in

building all the houses, and the consequent dissension among co-builders. The evaluators noted that, if uncorrected, this flaw in the approach to collaborative house construction could jeopardize the overall success of the Ke Aka Ho'ona project.

Subsequently, the project staff revised the collaborative house construction plan, so that in subsequent house construction increments, houses would not be assigned to pairs of co-builders until all houses in the increment had been completed. As a result, throughout the remainder of the project, the evaluators reported that the collaborative approach to house construction was functioning as intended and that co-builders were getting along quite well as they worked on the different houses. Thus, the benefits of interim evaluative feedback were twofold. First, the evaluation helped the project staff make an early correction in the house construction approach. Second, the lesson learned in the final evaluation report would help the foundation plan similar projects and also assist other groups seeking to replicate the Ke Aka Ho'ona approach.

Use of Evaluative Feedback for Accountability

President Lyons made the external evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona part of the foundation's accountability to the foundation's board and to external groups, such as accreditation organizations. The foundation's board commissioned Lyons to write a book on the foundation's early history, especially as reflected in the Ke Aka Ho'ona project. The board stipulated that this book would not be published but would be preserved in the foundation's private archives. The book would inform future foundation leaders of the strengths and weaknesses of past projects, warts and all. In writing the book, Lyons made extensive use of the lessons learned from the evaluation of the Ke Aka Ho'ona project. Her book, which would be of such great use by future foundation leaders, is an apt example of how organizations should preserve and make future uses of lessons learned.

A Few Afterthoughts

It has been many years since The Evaluation Center completed its work in evaluating the Ke Aka Ho'ona project. On a recent trip through Hawaii, the evaluation's director (Daniel Stufflebeam) drove to the Waianae Coast to see how things may have developed

or stayed the same in the Ke Aka Ho'ona community and the surrounding environment. He was very pleased to talk with some of the original project beneficiaries. If anything, he observed that the area surrounding Ke Aka Ho'ona had gotten even more depressed than he remembered from visits there in 2002. Numerous area beaches were covered with the shacks and tents of squatters, many of whom likely were homeless.

However, Ke Aka Ho'ona continued to be a beautiful, suburban-like community: an island of plenty in the midst of poverty. Almost all of the houses and lots were in good repair and well maintained. There was a quiet air of tranquility in this community. On the surface, it appeared that the Consuelo Foundation had made many sound decisions in its original selection of families, planning of the community, establishment of covenants, arrangement of mortgages for the participating families, design of houses, management of the construction process, and continuing oversight of the project. Following Stufflebeam's impromptu visit to the project site, he was convinced that evaluation and wise use of findings by foundation and project officials played an important part in what appeared to him to be a continuing success story.

Summary

This chapter illustrates and explains the CIPP Model's correct, effective application. Contracted by Hawaii's Consuelo Foundation, the Western Michigan University Evaluation Center in 1994 launched and conducted an 8-year, formative and summative evaluation of the innovative Ke Aka Ho'ona (Spirit of Consuelo) project. This inaugural project of the foundation helped 75 low-income families, including 155 adults and 235 children, build their own houses, while simultaneously creating a nurturing neighborhood free from violence and substance abuse. The project was located on a 12-acre plot within Oahu's Waianae Coast area, an area plagued by poverty and crime. In each of eight successive increments lasting approximately one year, the foundation assisted between 7 and 17 families to obtain low-interest mortgages and construct their own, high-quality houses, or, for a few families, to participate on a rent-to-own basis. Subsequently, over about 40 years each family, with a mortgage, was expected to pay off the mortgage and an associated land lease. The project's secondary purpose was to afford the new foundation a hands-on learning experience from

which it could build its capacity to plan, conduct, and evaluate effective projects. The evaluation focused on the foundation's mission of serving poor families and abused and neglected women and children in Hawaii and the Philippines; adhered to professional evaluation standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy; systematically engaged the full range of project stakeholders in the evaluation process; referenced the foundation's stated positive values in defining evaluative criteria; collected and reported a wide range of relevant qualitative and quantitative information; addressed questions related to the project's context, plans, implementation, and outcomes; continuously informed the project's decision-making process; delivered periodic project accountability reports to the foundation's board; and, in particular, assisted foundation leaders and the project's beneficiaries in pursuing and achieving enduring, positive project outcomes. Through this extensive programming and attendant evaluation experience, the foundation's board, president, and staff conducted an innovative, successful project. The project's success was patently apparent to visitors to the project site, who came from throughout the United States and several other countries to see what had been accomplished. The project's impacts were evident in the excellent living and learning conditions of 390 adults and children; in their pride in what they had accomplished; in the secure, beautiful, well-maintained neighborhood and the well-kept individual properties; in the spirit of community that was beginning to emerge among the 75 families; and in the neighborhood's freedom from violence, substance abuse, crime, and overcrowding. Ultimately, the foundation used lessons learned from this project to strengthen its policies and procedures for planning, conducting, and evaluating other projects in Hawaii and the Philippines.

This chapter was prepared by the director of the evaluation of the Consuelo project and gives an account of an 8-year effort to apply the CIPP Model in conducting formative and summative evaluations of a self-help housing project for a selected group of Hawaii's **working poor** as well as a few families who fit the definition of Hawaii's poorest of the poor. Basically, the chapter discusses 11 important ingredients of the evaluation of the project labeled Ke Aka Ho'ona. These key ingredients are as follows:

- Providing evaluation-oriented leadership.
- Referencing the client organization's values in defining evaluative criteria and interpreting findings.

- Keying the evaluation to professional standards for evaluations.
- Conducting formative metaevaluation to help plan and guide a sound evaluation and conducting and reporting a summative metaevaluation of how well the completed evaluation adhered to the standards of the evaluation profession.
- Employing a cost-reimbursable evaluation planning grant.
- Using the CIPP Model to guide the evaluation.
- Employing multiple qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.
- Reporting formative and summative findings.
- Budgeting adequately and frugally expending the evaluation's funds.
- Engaging a wide range of talented foundation representatives and evaluation team members to carry out the needed evaluation tasks.
- Facilitating the use of findings for project improvement, accountability, and evaluation capacity development.

Overall, the case reported in this chapter represents an exemplary application of the CIPP Model.

REVIEW QUESTIONS • • • • •

1. List actions that President Patti Lyons took in the case to deserve the description "evaluation-oriented leader."
2. Reflect on a project with which you are familiar. Then record a concrete example of how you could have used the stated values of the organization that conducted the project to address each of the following: clarifying and validating the project's goals, judging the project's plan of action, judging the project's treatment of project staff, and searching for side effects.
3. In your judgment, what are the pros and cons of clarifying foundational values for use in carrying out a project evaluation?
4. What rationale does this chapter give for starting an evaluation assignment with a separate evaluation planning grant? What are the pros, cons, and applicability of this recommendation?
5. In the Ke Aka Ho'ona case, beyond the Western Michigan University evaluation team, what group conducted the CIPP Model's input evaluation component, and what were the essential features of this input evaluation?
6. In evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona, what main types of information were collected to carry out the context evaluation, and what was the relevance of the information for carrying out the project?
7. What is the traveling observer technique, what is it for, what is the nature and role of a Traveling Observer's Handbook, and how was the technique employed in evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona?
8. What is the feedback workshop technique, what was its use in evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona, where could you find additional information—beyond that provided in this chapter—about the technique, and what do you see as the essential tasks in applying this technique?
9. What are the unique features of the goal-free evaluation technique, how was it applied in evaluating Ke Aka Ho'ona, and what do you see as this technique's pros and cons?
10. Considering this chapter's discussion of budgeting for evaluation, explain and support with examples what is meant by the dual stipulations that an evaluator should budget both adequately and frugally.
11. What does this chapter mean by the role of "evaluation-oriented leader"? Outline a workshop that you might conduct to help administrators learn the responsibilities of an evaluation-oriented leader and how to carry out these responsibilities.
12. Construct an eight-by-two matrix, with the row headings consisting of the Consuelo Foundation's stated values and the column headings being formative reports and summative reports. In each of the matrix's 16 cells, provide a statement of the pertinent value's relevance to providing needed formative or summative feedback.
13. Choose a project that you might propose to evaluate and assume that the client is amenable to awarding an evaluation planning grant in advance of negotiating the larger evaluation agreement. List the objectives and the attendant tasks for conducting this planning grant.

14. For the project you identified in response to Question 13, reference this chapter's discussion of reporting summative evaluation; then outline and explain the main parts of a summative evaluation report that your group might plan to deliver.
15. Given that a main requirement of standards for evaluations is assuring that findings are used, list steps you would take to ensure that all of a project's stakeholders would learn and make appropriate, effective use of the final, summative evaluation findings.

NOTES

1. In the native Hawaiian language, *Ke Aka Ho'ona* roughly means "The Spirit of Consuelo." This project title was chosen in honor of the benefactress who established the Consuelo Foundation: Mrs. Consuelo Zobel Alger.

2. In symbolic commemoration of Mrs. Alger's wishes, the Foundation planted shower trees throughout the Ke Aka Ho'ona community.

3. Sixteen legitimate approaches to program evaluation are reviewed in Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007). Chapter 12 summarizes the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona, and Chapters 13 through 18 show how the approaches of experimental design, case study, the CIPP Model, consumer-oriented evaluation, responsive evaluation, and utilization-focused evaluation can be applied to conduct a follow-up evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona. Subsequent chapters on the methods of evaluation and on metaevaluation also draw on lessons learned from the evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona.

4. Interested readers may view the actual photographs included in the photographic reprises at the end of each subreport in *The Spirit of Consuelo* report by accessing the report at www.wmich.edu/evalctr.