

INDEX

A

- Academic sector
 - accrediting evaluation programs by, 102–103
 - assessing student performance by, 103–104
 - developing and updating evaluation curricula by, 101–102
 - questions for university faculty on evaluation curricula, 103
 - research agendas formed by, 104
- Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD), 112, 125–127
- Academy of Management, 126
- Accountability
 - CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct* on, 120
 - definition of, 157
 - increasing focus on evaluator, 156–157
- Accrediting evaluation programs, 102–103
- Accuracy standards, 116–117
- Advances in Developing Human Resources* (journal), 158
- AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators*, 14, 15, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 117–118, 126
- African Evaluation Guidelines, 17, 18, 19*t*–21*t*
- AHRD standards (1999), 19*t*–21*t*
- Altschuld, J. W., 112, 130
- American Educational Research Association, 112, 126
- American Evaluation Association (AEA), 4, 14, 15, 17, 61, 112, 117, 126
- American National Standards Institute, 113
- American Psychological Association, 112, 126
- American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), 157
- Analyzing data, 49, 85–88
- Associations
 - competency use benefits to, 107

- competency use by, 106–107
- evaluator experience and involvement in, 148–194
 - See also* Organizations
- Audio conferencing, 83–84
- Australasian Evaluation Society, 4, 112, 123–125
- AVA Guiding Principles (2004), 14, 15, 17, 19*t*–21*t*

B

- Bamberger, M., 153
- Bartel, A. P., 9
- BCR (benefit-cost ratio), 9
- Behavioral objectives approach, 67
- Beywl, W., 122
- Bloom, B. S., 67
- Brinkerhoff, R. O., 7, 11
- Brinkerhoff's impact map, 11
- Brinkerhoff's stage model, 7–8
- Brinkerhoff's success case evaluation method, 11
- Brown, R., 61
- Burns, J. Z., 15
- Buros Institute, 76
- Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook* (Buros Institute), 76
- Bushnell, D. S., 8, 67

C

- Cambridge University Press, 156
- Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), 4, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 118–119
- Carey, J. O., 38
- Carey, L., 38
- Catano, V., 39
- Certification, 106
- CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct* (Canadian Evaluation Society), 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 118–122
- CES National Conference (1994), 119
- Chan, D., 5

Christie, C. A., 158
 Code of Ethics (AES), 123–125
 Communication
 for dissemination, 88–90
 evaluator competencies related to, 46–47, 52–55
 maintaining dialogue on the evaluation through, 91
 validation survey on, 135–136e
 Competence performance, 118
 Competency modeling
 brief history of, 38
 ibstpi competency development model for, 38–43
 See also Evaluator competencies
 Conference Board, 3
 Confidentiality issue, 61
 Conflict of interest, 115
 Consultants
 competency use by, 104–105
 questions for training, 105
 Consumer approach, 68
 Content analyses, 87, 116
 Convenience sampling, 78
 Costs
 cost-effectiveness issue of, 114
 fiscal responsibility issue of, 115
 Credibility, 47, 55–58, 114
 Criticality ratings, 142–144, 145t–146t

D

Data
 analyzing and interpreting the, 49, 85–88, 116
 disseminating the, 49–50, 88–90, 114, 115
 quantitative and qualitative, 86–87, 116
 storage, security, and disposal of, 79
 utility standards on, 114
 validity of, 77–78, 86, 116
 Data collection
 defensible sources used for, 116
 devising strategies for, 48–49, 73–79
 implementing plan for, 49, 81–85
 pilot testing instruments/procedures of, 49, 80–81
 Data triangulation, 86
 de la Teja, I., 14
 Defensible information sources, 116
 DeGEval Standards (2001), 19t–21t, 122–123

See also German Evaluation Society
 Standards for Evaluation
 Development evaluation, 158
 Dick, W. O., 38
Dictionary of Occupational Titles, 15
 Dignity, 115
 Dissemination
 communication used for, 49–50
 four performance guidelines for, 88–90
 propriety standards on, 115
 utility standards on, 114
 Documentation, 116
 Domains. *See* Evaluator domains
 Donaldson, S. I., 158
 Dunet, D. O., 10

E

e-project, 91
 EBSCO, 76
 Engelhart, M. D., 67
 Engle, Altschuld, and Kim survey (2006), 112, 129–130
 Engle, M., 112
 Erickson, P. R., 6
 Ethical and legal issues
 accountability as, 120, 156–157
 CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct on, 17, 19t–21t, 112, 118–122
 Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations (AES) on, 112, 123–125
 ibstpi competency of, 47, 60–62
 Standards on Ethics and Integrity (AHRD) on, 112, 125–127
 See also Evaluator competencies
 EvalTalk, 130
 Evaluation
 development, 158
 focus of, 154–155
 global competence and internationalization of, 158–159
 impact of, 114
 increasing importance placed on, 3–4
 negotiating formal proposal for, 73
 outsourcing, 155–156
 professional recognition of, 16
 See also Standards
 Evaluation agreements
 negotiating formal proposal for, 73
 propriety standards on, 115
Evaluation and Change (journal), 158

- Evaluation and Program Planning* (journal), 158
- Evaluation implementation domain
 analyzing and interpreting data, 49, 85–88
 collecting the data, 40, 81–85
 criticality ratings of, 145*t*
 disseminating the findings, 49–50, 88–90, 114, 115
 level of support by number and percentage, 143*t*, 144*t*
- Evaluation management
 criticality ratings of, 146*t*
 level of support by number and percentage for, 143*t*, 144*t*
 monitoring the management plan, 50, 90–91
 working with personnel and stakeholders while, 50, 91–93
- Evaluation planning/designing domain
 criticality ratings of, 145*t*
 developing effective evaluation plan, 48, 64–69
 developing evaluation management plan, 48, 69–73
 devising data collection strategies supporting evaluation, 48–49, 73–79
 level of support by number/percentage, 143*t*, 144*t*
 pilot testing data collection instruments, 49, 80–81
- Evaluation plans
 for data collection, 48–49, 73–81
 developing effective, 48, 64–69
 implementing the, 49–50, 81–90
- Evaluation politics
 awareness of, 48, 62–64, 114
 organization type and, 148
- Evaluation Practice* (journal), 158
- Evaluation programs
 accrediting, 102–103
 accuracy standards related to features of, 116–117
 curricula related to, 101–102, 103
 domains of evaluator competencies derived from, 22, 32–33
 literature study on competencies covered by, 22
See also Standards
- Evaluation Quarterly* (journal), 158
- Evaluation research
 examining the development of, 4
 forming agendas for, 104
 ibstpi's foundational, 111–131, 134
 literature study of, 16–34
 practice-oriented atheoretical approach to, 5–7
 process-driven operational approach to, 7–9
 research-oriented, practice-based comprehensive approach to, 10–12
 validation, 133–151
- Evaluation Review* (journal), 158
- Evaluation teams
 debriefing, 92
 managing, 100
 managing evaluation while working with, 50, 91–93
- Evaluation textbooks
 comparing contents of, 23*t*–26*t*
 domains of evaluator competencies derived from, 22, 32–33
 evaluation competency frameworks from, 22
- Evaluator competencies
 Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD), 128–129
CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct on, 119
 definition of, 16–17
 drafting of, 134
 evaluator-generated, 34–36
 literature study of, 16–34
 need to determine, 14–16
 ranking, 144–147
 use of, 96–108
 validation and rewriting of, 135
 validation research implications for, 149–151
See also Competency modeling; Ethical and legal issues; ibstpi Evaluator Competencies
- Evaluator competency use
 in academic settings, 101–104
 by associations, 106–107
 by consultants providing evaluation seminars, 104–105
 by experienced evaluators, 98–99
 by managers, 99–101
 by those new to evaluation, 97–98

Evaluator domains

- derived from standards, textbooks, and programs, 33–34
- implementing the evaluation plan, 49–50, 81–90, 114, 115, 142*t*, 143*t*, 145*t*
- level of support by average number/percentage, 143*t*
- managing the evaluation, 50, 90–98, 142*t*, 143*t*, 146*t*
- planning and designing the evaluation, 48–49, 64–81, 142*t*, 143*t*, 145*t*
- Professional Foundations, 46–48, 52–64, 142*t*, 143*t*, 145*t*

See also ibstpi Evaluator Competencies

Evaluators

- competency use by, 97–108
- competency use by managers of, 99–101
- evaluator competencies generated by, 34–36
- experience/evaluation association involvement by, 148–194
- ibstpi assumptions about competencies and, 43–45
- identifying the stakeholders, 66
- implementing ibstpi competency development model for, 43
- increasing professionalism and accountability of, 156–157
- internal versus external, 147–148
- literature study on standards for, 18, 22
- management roles of, 48, 69–73
- negotiating formal evaluation proposal, 73
- See also* ibstpi Evaluator Competencies

External evaluators, 147–148

F

- Fairness, 115
- Feasibility standards, 114
- Fields, D. C., 14, 17, 43
- Fiscal responsibility, 115
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., 158
- Five-level model, 7
- Flanagan, J. C., 38
- Focus groups, 83
- Ford, J. K., 5, 10
- Foundational research
 - CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct*, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 118–122
 - DeGEval standards (2001), 19*t*–21*t*, 122–123

Engle, Altschuld, and Kim survey (2006), 112, 129–130

Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations (AES), 112, 123–125

Guiding Principles for Evaluators (AEA), 14, 15, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 117–118, 126

King, Stevahn, Ghere, and Minneman work (2001), 112, 127–129

Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee), 14, 18, 111, 113, 126

Standards on Ethics and Integrity (AHRD), 112, 125–127

validation research beginning with review of, 134

works listed, 111–112

Foxon, M., 8, 14, 17, 39, 41, 142, 144

Furst, E. J., 67

G

Gantt charts, 70

Gates, S., 3

German Evaluation Society Standards for Evaluation, 17

See also DeGEval Standards (2001)

Ghere, G., 14, 112, 127, 128

Gill, S. J., 11

Google Scholar, 76

Grabowski, B., 14

Group interviews, 83–84

Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations (Australasian Evaluation Society), 112, 123–125

Guiding Principles for Evaluators (AEA), 14, 15, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 117–118, 126

H

Hale, J., 106

Hamblin, A. C., 6

Hamblin's five-level model, 6

Hawthorn, L. R., 157

Hendriks, M., 39

Hendry, I., 40

Hilbert, J., 5

Hill, W. H., 67

Holton, E. F., III, 7, 11

Holton's HRD evaluation research and measurement model, 11–12

Honesty, 118

Hooghiemstra, T., 39

- HR (Human Resources) Guide to the Internet, 40
- HRD (human resource development)
- competencies related to evaluation from, 15
 - competency use by managers of, 99–101
 - gathering performance information from, 84
 - ibstpi Evaluator Competencies acceptance by, 104, 105
 - lack of evaluation expertise by, 97
 - outsourcing evaluation by, 155–156
 - professional recognition of, 16
 - standards used as basis for programs by, 96
- Human Resource Development Quarterly* (journal), 158
- Human subject rights, 115
- Hurteau, M., 119
- I**
- ibstpi
- concerns with evaluator competencies, 14–15
 - evaluation competencies study commissioned by, 16
 - evaluation competency as defined by, 17
- ibstpi competency development model
- foundational research basis of, 111–131, 134
 - generic form of, 39–42
 - implementing for evaluators, 43
 - listed, 46–50
 - on nature of competence and competencies, 39
 - structure of the, 42*fig*
 - three phases of, 17
- ibstpi Evaluator Competencies
- assumptions underlying the, 43–45
 - credibility of, 104
 - evaluation practice and context of, 153–154
 - foundational research basis of, 111–131
 - list of, 46–50
 - use of, 96–108
 - validation research on, 133–151
 - See also* Evaluator competencies; Evaluator domains; Evaluators
- Impartial reporting, 117
- Information. *See* Data
- Input, Process, Output Model, 8
- Institutional Review Board (Oregon State University), 135
- Instruments
- pilot testing data collection, 49, 80–81
 - validation study, 135–142
- Integrity, 118, 120
- Internal evaluators, 147–148
- International Board of Standards for Training, Performance, and Instruction. *See* ibstpi
- International Development Evaluation Association, 158
- International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation, 158
- Interpersonal skills competency, 47, 58–60
- Interpreting data, 49, 85–88
- Interviews
- collecting data using, 83
 - group, 83–84
- Investigator triangulation, 86
- J**
- Joint Committee on Educational and Psychological Tests, 77, 112–113
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 14, 18, 111, 113, 123
- Jones Enterprises, 67, 71
- Justified conclusions, 116
- K**
- Kaufman, R., 7, 38
- Keith, G., 119
- Keller, J. M., 7
- Kierstead, J., 38
- Kim, Y.-C., 112
- King, J. A., 14, 15, 16, 18, 34, 35, 112, 127, 128
- King, Stevahn, Ghere, and Minneman evaluation work (2001), 112, 127–129
- Kirkpatrick, D., 5, 6
- Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation model, 5–6
- Klein, A. L., 39
- Klein, J. D., 14
- Klemp, G. O., 16
- Kraiger, K., 5, 10
- Krathwol, D. R., 67
- L**
- Le Boterf, G., 39
- Learning outcomes model, 10

Lepsinger, R., 39, 41

Lincoln, R. E., 10

Literature study

- on academic and certificate programs, 22, 28*t*–32*t*
- on competencies derived from standards, textbooks, and programs, 33–34
- definitions and processes for competency modeling used in, 16–17
- on evaluator-generated competencies, 34–36
- on frameworks from evaluation texts, 22, 23*t*–27*t*
- research questions to prepare for, 16
- search process used for, 17–18
- on standards for evaluators, 18–22

Lucia, D., 39, 41

M

Mabry, L., 153

Mager, R. F., 67

Maggio, E., 40

Management

- competency use by, 99–101
 - planning evaluation, 48, 67–73
- Management plans
- approach to, 67–68
 - for evaluation management, 48, 69–73
 - monitoring, 50, 90–91

Managing evaluations

- criticality ratings of, 146*t*
- level of support by number and percentage, 143*t*, 144*t*
- monitoring the management plan, 50, 90–91
- working with personnel and stakeholders while, 50, 91–93

MARC (Multi-Attribute-Consensus

Reaching), 35

Marrelli, A. F., 40

McClelland, D. A., 16, 38

McDavid, J. C., 157

McGuire, M., 121, 122

McLagan, P., 15, 17, 39

Member checking, 86

Metaevaluation, 92–93, 117

Method triangulation, 86

Microsoft Excel, 70

Microsoft Project, 70, 91

Minnema, J., 14, 112, 127, 128

Multi-Attribute Consensus Building, 128

N

National Center for O*NET

Development, 38

National Council on Measurement in Education, 112

Navy Civilian Personnel Command model, 6

New Directions for Evaluation (journal), 158

Newman, C., 61

O

O*Net, 15, 38

Open workbench, 91

Organizational Development Network, 126

Organizations

- evaluation politics, respondents, and type of, 148
- focus of evaluations within, 154–155
- See also* Associations

Outsourcing evaluation, 155–156

P

Parry, S. B., 39

Patton, M. Q., 62, 64

Peer debriefing, 86

Performance Improvement Quarterly (journal), 158

Perrin, B., 121, 122

PERT charts, 70

Phillips, J. J., 9

Phillips, P. P., 9

Pilot testing instruments, 49, 80–81

Piontek, M., 146

Planning evaluations. *See* Evaluation planning/designing domain

Politics

- awareness of, 48, 62–64, 114
- organization type and, 148

Practice-oriented atheoretical approaches

- five-level model as, 7
- Hamblin's five-level model as, 6
- Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation model as, 5–6

Navy Civilian Personnel Command model as, 6

Swanson and Holton's results model as, 7

- Training Effectiveness Evaluation System
 - as, 6
 - Preskill, H., 4, 5, 12, 18, 63, 67, 102, 146
 - Privacy issue, 61
 - Process-driven operational approach
 - Brinkerhoff's stage model as, 7–8
 - Input, Process, Output Model as, 8
 - ROI (return on investment) model as, 9
 - Stages of Transfer Model as, 8–9
 - Professional credibility, 47, 55–58, 114
 - Professional Foundations
 - communication competency, 46–47, 52–55
 - criticality ratings of, 145*t*
 - ethical and legal standards, 47, 60–62
 - ibstpi (2006) overview on, 46–48
 - interpersonal skills, 47, 58–60
 - level of support by average number/percentage, 143*t*, 144*t*
 - politics of evaluation, 62–64, 114
 - professional credibility competency, 47, 55–58, 114
 - Professionalism, 156–157
 - Program Evaluation Standards* (Joint Committee), 14, 18, 111, 113, 126
 - Project management, 90–91
 - Propriety standards, 115
 - ProQuest, 76
 - Public welfare responsibilities, 118
 - Purposive sampling, 78
- Q**
- Qualitative data, 86, 87
 - Quantitative data, 86–87, 116
 - Questions
 - for experienced evaluators, 99
 - for those managing or recruiting evaluators, 101
 - for those new to evaluation, 97
- R**
- Raven, J., 17
 - Recording data, 83
 - “Reflections on a Code of Ethics” (Hurteau), 119
 - Reliable information, 116
 - Research. *See* Evaluation research
 - Research-oriented, practice-based comprehensive approaches
 - Brinkerhoff's impact map as, 11
 - Brinkerhoff's success case evaluation method as, 11
 - Holton's HRD evaluation research and measurement model as, 11–12
 - learning outcomes model as, 10
 - Preskill and Russ-Eft systems model as, 12
 - Systemic Model of Factors Predicting Employee Training Outcomes as, 10
 - training efficiency and effectiveness model as, 10
 - Respect, 118
 - Richey, R. C., 10, 14, 17, 39, 43, 134, 142, 144
 - Roberts, R. C., 14
 - ROI (return on investment) model, 9
 - Rothwell, W. J., 15
 - Rowe, C., 39
 - Rugh, J., 153
 - Ruona, W.E.A., 15
 - Rusaw, A. C., 15
 - Russ-Eft, D., 4, 5, 12, 15, 17, 18, 63, 67, 102
- S**
- Salas, E., 5, 10
 - Sampling
 - types and issues related to, 78
 - validation survey respondents and, 136–142
 - Sanders, J. R., 13, 15, 158
 - Scriven, M., 158
 - Service orientation standard, 115
 - Sixth Annual Conference of Human Resource Development Across Europe, 14
 - Skype, 84
 - Sleezer, C. M., 6
 - Smith, M. F., 15
 - Snowball sampling, 78
 - Societal Outcomes (megalevel), 7
 - Spannaus, T., 14
 - Spector, J. M., 14
 - Spencer, L. M., 39
 - Spencer, S. M., 39
 - Spitzer, D. R., 4, 7, 10
 - Stages of Transfer Model, 8–9
 - Stakeholders
 - debriefing, 92
 - evaluation impact on, 114
 - evaluation planning engagement by, 69
 - identifying the, 66, 113

- Stakeholders (*continued*)
 kept informed during evaluation process,
 72–73
 managing evaluation while working with,
 50, 91–93
- Standards
 accuracy, 116–117
 application of, 117
 comparison of various ethical codes or,
 19*t*–21*t*
 domains of evaluator competencies
 derived from, 33–34
 feasibility, 114
 foundational research on development of,
 111–112
 literature study on evaluator, 18, 22
 propriety, 115
 purpose and procedures of, 112–113
 utility, 113–114
See also Evaluation; Evaluation programs
Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals (Joint Committee), 77, 112
The Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials (Joint Committee), 13, 113
- Standards guiding principles
CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct, 17,
 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 118–122
 DeGEval standards (2001), 19*t*–21*t*,
 122–123
 Engle, Altschuld, and Kim survey (2006),
 112, 129–130
Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations (AES), 112, 123–125
Guiding Principles for Evaluators (AEA),
 14, 15, 17, 19*t*–21*t*, 112, 117–118, 126
 King, Stevahn, Ghore, and Minneman
 work (2001), 112, 127–129
Program Evaluation Standards (Joint
 Committee), 14, 18, 111, 113, 126
Standards on Ethics and Integrity
 (AHRD), 112, 125–127
Standards on Ethics and Integrity (AHRD),
 112, 125–127
- Stephenson, J., 17
 Stevahn, L., 14, 112, 127, 128
 Student performance assessment, 103–104
 Stufflebeam, D. L., 8, 67
 Swanson, R. A., 6, 7
- Systematic information, 116
 Systematic inquiry, 118
 Systemic Model of Factors Predicting
 Employee Training Outcomes, 10
 Systems model, 12
- ## T
- T&D* (journal), 158
 T&D (training and development)
 competency use by managers in, 99–101
 ibstpi Evaluator Competencies acceptance
 by, 104, 105
 lack of evaluation expertise by, 97
 standards used as basis for programs
 by, 96
 Taut, S., 122
 Taylor, P., 5
Tests in Print (Buros Institute), 76
 Thematic analyses, 87
 Toolsema, B., 39
 Torres, R. T., 146
 Training Effectiveness Evaluation System, 6
 Training efficiency and effectiveness
 model, 10
Training (journal), 158
 Tyler, R., 67
- ## U
- U.S. Department of Education, 4
 Utility standards, 113–114
- ## V
- Valid information, 116
 Validation factors
 geographic location, 147
 internal or external evaluator,
 147–148
 organization type, 148
 years of experience and evaluation
 association involvement, 148–149
 Validation research
 on competency ranking, 144–147
 on factors contributing to significant
 differences, 147–149
 implications for the final evaluator
 competencies, 149–151
 procedures, 134–142
 purpose and scope of, 133–134
 on ratings of criticality, 142–144*t*,
 145*t*–146*t*

- Validation survey
 - sample selection/respondents of, 136–142
 - three sections and content of, 135–136*e*
 - Validation survey respondents
 - background characteristics of, 136
 - demographics of, 137*t*–138
 - evaluator profile of, 140*t*–142
 - occupational profile of the, 138*t*–140
 - Validity
 - accuracy standards on, 116
 - of quantitative and qualitative data, 86
 - six types of, 77–78
 - van der Klink, M. R., 39
 - van Merriënboer, A. P., 39
 - Van Mondfrans, A. P., 38
 - Videoconferencing, 83–84
- W**
- Wang, G. G., 4, 7, 10
 - Watkins, R., 7
 - Watson, K., 38
 - Websites
 - American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 157
 - American Society for Training and Development, 157
 - e-project, 91
 - EBSCO, 76
 - Google Scholar, 76
 - International Development Evaluation Association, 158
 - International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation, 158
 - Microsoft Project, 91
 - O*Net, 15
 - Open workbench, 91
 - ProQuest, 76
 - Skype, 84
 - WilsonWeb, 76
 - Zoomberang, 54
 - Weiss, C., 62
 - Wholey, J., 11
 - WilsonWeb, 76
 - Woodruff, C., 39
 - Worthen, B. R., 13, 15, 158
 - Wright, H. F., 15
- Y**
- Young, J. I., 38
- Z**
- Zoomberang, 54
 - Zorzi, R., 121, 122

