Review of Evaluation Journal of Australasia Volume 6, No. 1

Wes Martz
Western Michigan University

Editors Rosalind Hurworth and Delwyn Goodrick include four refereed articles, two book reviews, and the keynote address from the AES 2005 International Conference in this issue of the Evaluation Journal of Australasia.

The keynote address by Sue Funnel, director of Performance Improvement Pty. Ltd. and past president of the Australasian Evaluation Society, was finalized following the conference and included her reflections on the conference. Funnel (2006) structured her keynote address around four primary concerns with respect to current evaluation practice. Those concerns include (i) the growing popularity and disturbing trends of M&E (monitoring and evaluation), (ii) the "silver bullet" mentality of causality as presented in evaluation questions, (iii) evaluation frameworks that "straight-jacket" program participant outcomes without regard to context, and (iv) the lack of criticality and discrimination of data use. A common thread woven throughout the keynote address was the need for realism (i.e., practicality) in evaluation combined with serious metaevaluation of evaluation practices.

Jeff Bost's (2006) article "Evaluation for Management and Development" presented a case study of the evaluation of an aid program in Papua New Guinea. Bost outlines the evaluation approach taken and assesses the program in its current state. Although not specifically referred to as participatory evaluation, the fundamental approach presented in the case study was participatory consisting of a professional evaluator working with the program implementers to evaluate the aid program. The collaboration members chose to use two of the five evaluation forms developed by Owen & Rogers (1999) including "clarificative" and "interactive." These approaches are intended to be used with programs under development, and feature logic and theory development and evaluability assessment. The collaboration team placed considerable attention on program goals while the values and needs of program recipients (i.e., impactees) were not mentioned in the review. It is possible a needs assessment was conducted previous to this evaluation exercise, but the author does not make reference to this point.

The second refereed article, "Increasing the Rigour and Trustworthiness of Participatory Evaluations: Learnings from the Field" by June Lennie (2006), addresses the issue of credibility and utilization of evaluations that use a participatory approach. Lennie focuses her arguments on participatory evaluation and participatory action research of community-based programs and initiatives; specifically on openly political approaches of feminist evaluation. Lennie suggests six strategies to increase rigor and trustworthiness for this evaluation approach including: 1) community participation methods that develop mutual trust and open dialogue, 2) using multiple theories, methodologies, and sources of data, 3) ongoing metaevaluation and critical reflection, 4) employing critical assessment of the impacts of evaluations, 5) rigorous data analysis and

reporting, and 6) participant reviews of evaluation case studies, data analysis, and reports. Of the six strategies offered, three include some degree of metaevaluation or critical reflection. Although Lennie does not offer specifics on how to metaevaluate or what standards might be relevant to the critical assessments, use of the Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee, 1994) the metaevaluation checklist (Stufflebeam, 1999), or the Model for Collaborative Evaluations Checklist (Rodriguez-Campos, 2005) may be of value to those participants asked to metaevaluate and critically reflect on evaluation drafts, case studies, and reports.

Graeme Harvey and Rosalind Hurworth authored the third refereed article titled "Exploring Program Sustainability: Identifying Factors in Two Educational Initiatives in Victoria." In this article, the authors presented two case studies of school-based health initiatives with a focus on program sustainability. Harvey and Hurworth (2006) briefly summarize the various interpretations of the term sustainability, and base their paper on the general definition "continuation of a program with specific emphasis placed on continuation of the benefits of the program to stakeholders or continuation of the initiative itself." To review the sustainability component of two school-based health initiatives, the authors used a framework based on the work done by Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) and Fullan (1996) with respect to program implementation and sustainability. The article concludes with an attempt to link the authors' findings to the evaluation work of others. They emphasize the importance of planning for sustainability from the inception of the program, and suggest evaluators utilize the clarificative evaluation (Owen, 1999) approach early in the program development.

The final refereed article considered evaluation support and how support can be leveraged to strengthen the overall quality and use of an evaluation. Coryn (2006) focuses his

arguments around Michael Scriven's *Key Evaluation Checklist* (KEC) checkpoint #14: Report and Support (Scriven, 2005, 2006), and expands on the various attributes of this checkpoint. Coryn provides a brief review of the KEC and checkpoint #14, and then addresses specific issues with respect to the differences between support and the reporting and dissemination of an evaluation. The fundamental purposes and methods of providing evaluation support are covered in detail with the specific types of support articulated as general support, technical support, direct and indirect support, and alternative scenarios. Each of these types of support includes detailed references to Scriven's writings and communications on the topic. The article concludes with suggestions regarding how to incorporate support services into evaluations and the potential benefits improved support may provide to the client and other relevant stakeholders.

References

Bost, J. (2006). Evaluation for management and development. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 6*(1), 13-26.

Coryn, C. L. S. (2006). A conceptual framework for making evaluation support meaningful, useful, and valuable. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 6*(1), 45-51.

Fullan, M. G. (1996). Implementation of innovations, in T. Plomp & D.P. Ely (eds.), *International encyclopedia of educational terminology.* 2nd ed. London: Pergamon.

Funnel, S. (2006). AES 2005 international conference keynote address. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 6*(1), 3-10.

Harvey, G. & Hurworth, R. (2006). Exploring program sustainability: Identifying factors in two educational initiatives in Victoria. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 6*(1), 36-44.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to access and evaluate educational programs.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lennie, J. (2006). Increasing the rigour and trustworthiness of participatory evaluations: Learnings from the field. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 6*(1), 27-35.

Owen, J. M. & Rogers, P. J. (1999). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches.* 2nd ed. St. Leonards, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Rodriguez-Campos, L. (2005). *Collaborative evaluations: A step-by-step model for the evaluator.* Tamarac, FL: Llumina Press.

Scriven, M. (2005). *Key evaluation checklist.* [No longer available].

Scriven, M. (2006). *Key evaluation checklist.* Retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/kec_june06.pdf

Shediac-Rizkallah, M. C. & Bone, L. R. (1998). Planning for the sustainability of community-based health programs: Conceptual frameworks and future directions for research, practice, and policy. *Health Education Research, 13*, 203-215.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1999). *Program evaluations metaevaluation checklist.* Retrieved March 14, 2006 from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/program_metaeval.pdf