

Equity-Focused Evaluation Approaches: Annotated Bibliography

Key References for Seven Culturally Responsive and Equity-Focused Evaluation Approaches

Submitted By:

Katrina Bledsoe and Blanca Guillen-Woods
of Strategic Learning Partners for Innovation

Felisa Gonzales
of The Colorado Trust



Submitted to Annie E. Casey Foundation
July, 2022



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	3
Overview	3
Culturally Competent Evaluation	4
Culturally Responsive Evaluation	7
Culturally Responsive Equitable Evaluation	10
Culturally Responsive Indigenous Evaluation	12
Empowerment Evaluation	14
Equity-Focused Evaluations	17
Transformative Evaluation	21

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Kantaynee Murray, former Senior Research Associate/Program Officer of the Research Evaluation division of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and now Senior Associate Director at the MPH Center for Culturally Responsive Engagement for her continued support and thought partnership in commissioning the current work.

OVERVIEW

This bibliography is designed to provide theoretical grounding for key equity-focused and culturally responsive evaluation approaches. The compilation of sources was honed through a broad, but not necessarily comprehensive, review. The following sources are those that we consider key references that inform readers, evaluators, and other interested constituents about the history, principles, and practice of these approaches. This bibliography should be used as a companion piece to the equity-focused evaluation approach matrix. The matrix has been designed to assist in evaluative work, particularly as it relates to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).

To show the evolution of thought within each approach, we listed the references in order of publication date rather than by author last name. Citation listings with links provide direct access to the articles, blogs, presentations, and so forth within the document.

CULTURALLY COMPETENT EVALUATION

Hopson, R. K. (2003). *Overview of multicultural and culturally competent program evaluation: Issues, challenges and opportunities*. The California Endowment.
<https://www.uaf.edu/ces/files/internal/reporting/programevals/MultiOverviewBook.pdf>

This paper provides a clear and succinct history of how multicultural and culturally competent evaluation approaches rose in prominence in the early 2000s. Hopson discusses how the cross-cultural application of evaluation in international contexts led to reflection on the practice of evaluation in different domestic contexts. The author also discusses how professional organizations (e.g., American Evaluation Association [AEA]) and funders (e.g., Kellogg and the National Science Foundation) supported early efforts to “deliberate on the relevance and significance of cultural context in evaluation.” The paper ends with five basic tenets of culturally competent evaluation as well as some suggestions for moving the evaluation field forward, many of which have come to fruition over the past two decades.

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). *Cultural competence in evaluation: An overview*. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 102, 5–19.

In this chapter, the authors argue that culture is an integral part of the context of evaluation and must be considered and addressed in evaluations. The authors share examples of how culture manifests in policymaking, program development, and service delivery and discuss methodological and ethical considerations for including cultural context in evaluation. Examples of how culture has been addressed in evaluation approaches prior to 2004 also are presented. The chapter concludes with a discussion of a few steps that the evaluation field as a whole, and the AEA in particular, can take to bolster culturally competent evaluation theory and practice (see annotated reference for the AEA Statement on Cultural Competence, below). A particularly helpful contribution of the chapter is its explicit definition of cultural competence in evaluation: “Cultural competence in evaluation can be broadly defined as a systematic, responsive inquiry that is actively cognizant, understanding and appreciative of the cultural context in which the evaluation takes place; that frames and articulates the epistemology of the evaluative endeavor; that employs culturally and contextually appropriate methodology; and that uses stakeholder-generated interpretive means to arrive at the results and further use of the findings.”

Endo Inouye, T., Cao Yu, H., & Adefuin, J. (2005). *Commissioning multicultural evaluation: A foundation resource guide*. Social Policy Research Associates.
<https://www.spra.com/wordpress2/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/TCE-Commissioning-Multi-cultural-Eva.pdf>

Although this publication includes the term *multicultural evaluation* in its title, the authors note that this term is often used interchangeably with *culturally competent evaluation*, as both are rooted in considerations of culture and diversity. Specifically, multicultural evaluation is defined as “evaluation that integrates cultural considerations into its theory, measures, analysis and practice” and includes five core principles: inclusion in design and implementation, acknowledgment /infusion of multiple worldviews, cultural and systems analysis, appropriate measures of success, and relevance to diverse communities. This publication was funded by The California Endowment and “was designed to assist foundation staff with evaluations of initiatives and programs working with diverse communities.” It has sections on how to build the case for and make the shift to multicultural evaluation, conceptualize a multicultural evaluation, commission a multicultural evaluation, and monitor and assess a multicultural evaluation. It

includes several useful tables and graphics that include data and resources. Funders who already use a multicultural or culturally competent approach may find the suggestions for commissioning and monitoring evaluations particularly valuable.

Lee, K. (2007). *The Importance of culture in evaluation: A practical guide for evaluators*. The Colorado Trust. <https://www.communityscience.com/pdfs/CrossCulturalGuide.r3.pdf>

Lee notes, “There are three key characteristics that affect interactions among people and are therefore critical considerations in cross-culturally competent evaluation: (1) culture, (2) social identity or group membership, and (3) privilege and power.” The last two—social identity and privilege—are given more attention than are other culturally competent references included in this annotated bibliography. The author notes four aspects of culturally competent evaluators and provides strategies and questions within each of the three characteristics above that evaluators can use to enhance their practice of culturally competent evaluation.

American Evaluation Association (AEA). (2011). *Statement on cultural competence in evaluation*. <https://www.eval.org/ccstatement>

Through this statement, which was developed over a six-year period and approved in 2011, the AEA affirms the significance of cultural competence in evaluation and explicitly ties it to two of the AEA’s guiding principles: (1) competence and (2) common good and equity. The statement includes the roles, definitions, and importance of culture and cultural competence in quality evaluation. AEA argues that cultural competence is an ethical imperative and that culture is central to theories and determinations of validity. The statement ends with a discussion of four different practices that can serve as a starting point for developing and implementing culturally competent evaluations. AEA’s statement makes it clear that cultural competence is expected of all evaluators and should not be viewed as a niche practice or skill.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2014). *Practical strategies for culturally competent evaluation: Evaluation guide*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov/asthma/program_eval/cultural_competence_guide.pdf

This publication presents the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) framework for program evaluation in public health and provides strategies, tips, and guiding questions to ensure cultural competence throughout the evaluation process. The CDC’s framework consists of six steps: (1) engage stakeholders, (2) describe the program, (3) focus the evaluation design, (4) gather credible evidence, (5) justify conclusions, and (6) ensure use of findings and share lessons learned. Readers who want to ensure cultural competence in evaluation are reminded, in the conclusion, to “engage stakeholders and keep them involved throughout the evaluation process; be aware of personal culture and biases; highlight community strengths and assets, including the talents and expertise of the members; consider how aspects of culture might influence an evaluation’s design and implementation; ensure that multiple perspectives are represented when determining what counts as credible evidence; recognize potential cultural implications during data collection, analysis, and interpretation; tailor the dissemination of evaluation results to stakeholder needs; and promote use of evaluation information for community benefit.” The publication includes several appendices that link evaluation standards with strategies to increase cultural competence, provide further resources and tools, and share tips and guiding questions for ensuring cultural competence in evaluation. This is a useful resource that goes beyond defining cultural competence to operationalizing ways to conduct evaluations that have cultural relevance and are of value to stakeholders.

Thomas, V.G., Madison, A., Rockcliffe, F., DeLaine, K. & McDonald-Lowe, S. (2018). Racism, social programming, and evaluation: Where do we go from here? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 39(4), 514-526.

This article comes from the special section on Race and Evaluation in the American Journal of Evaluation. Thomas et al, argue that evaluators and researchers cannot simply review and evaluate programs in a vacuum; the sociocultural, historical, political and organizational contexts must be considered. Specifically, they encourage evaluators to understand how evaluation training (e.g., axiology, ontology, epistemology and methodology) can be biased. Thomas et al argue that race and racism inherently shapes the way evaluations are developed including definitions of what is considered a desirable outcome and solutions to achieving it. The article offers three specific actions for evaluators including (a) examining personal biases that might be held about populations of focus; (b) interrogating the program theory underlying the program strategy and outcomes; and (c) being thoughtful about how systems and structures affect the lives of populations of focus. This article is designed to help evaluators think through the use of evaluation approaches, with an eye towards considering the use of culturally responsive evaluation approaches.

Thomas, V.G. & Campbell, P. B. (2020). *Evaluation in today's world: Respecting diversity, improving quality, and promoting usability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Thomas & Campbell's evaluation textbook is seminal in the fact that it is the first evaluation training textbook to be written with an equity-focused and culturally responsive lens. It is unique in that it is written with an eye towards the centering of race. Thomas & Campbell argue that evaluators need to be culturally competent (they go so far as to say cultural competence is an ethical imperative) and their evaluations need to be culturally responsive. In addition to chapters on traditional topics and issues in evaluation (e.g. ethics, paradigms, planning, questions, design, data collection, analysis, dissemination), the book attends to issues of social justice and social change. Key considerations for the reader are (a) conversations with practitioners and scholars who are working on the ground in evaluation, and (b) real-world case studies that provide examples for the reader on conducting evaluations with a racialized lens.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE EVALUATION

Frierson, H., Hood, S., & Hughes, G. (2002). Strategies that address culturally responsive evaluation. In J. Frechtling (Ed.), *The 2002 user friendly handbook for project evaluation* (pp. 63–76). National Science Foundation.
<https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf02057/nsf02057.pdf>

One of the earlier references on the topic, this chapter begins by building a case for why culturally responsive evaluation approaches are needed. The authors argue that there are no culture-free evaluations and that it is imperative to “adopt evaluation strategies that are consonant with the cultural context(s) under evaluation.” The bulk of the chapter offers suggestions and strategies for integrating culturally responsive approaches in critical phases of the evaluation process: preparing for the evaluation, engaging stakeholders, identifying the purpose(s) and intent of the evaluation, framing the right questions, designing the evaluation, selecting and adapting instrumentation, collecting the data, analyzing the data, and disseminating and utilizing the results. Culturally responsive evaluation offers the promise of meeting “the needs of the project and those who are stakeholders in it” over the goal of compliance.

Hopson, R. K. (2009). Reclaiming knowledge at the margins: Culturally responsive evaluation in the current evaluation moment. In K. Ryan & J. B. Cousins (Eds.), *The Sage international handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 431–448). SAGE Publications, Inc.

This chapter is in the section, “Educational evaluation in a political world.” Hopson posits that “the social responsible stance of the culturally responsive evaluator and the evaluation contributes to thinking that promotes spaces of hope, praxis and social action for indigenous, marginalized, dispossessed communities, as well as their contexts, histories, struggles and ideals.” The author directly ties culturally responsive evaluation to issues of power, race, equity, and culture and, in doing so, acknowledges that it is a theoretical, conceptual, and inherently political position. Because this chapter focuses on the theoretical roots of culturally responsive evaluation rather than related strategies, it does not serve as a concrete resource. Nevertheless, it is a helpful reference for understanding how culturally responsive evaluation differs from traditional evaluation.

Kirkhart, K. (2013, April). *Repositioning validity* [Inaugural address]. Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment Inaugural Conference, Chicago, IL, United States.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.723.8358&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

This speech, presented at the *Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment Inaugural Conference*, serves as the basis for Karen Kirkhart’s position paper and subsequent works about why culture and context are key foundational aspects of evaluation. In this speech Kirkhart provides her perspective that validity is framed by culture, and introduces five aspects that undergird that frame: (1) theory, (2) relationships, (3) experiences, (4) consequences, and (5) methodology. She believes that centering validity in culture requires modeling, mentoring, and practice in applying these ideas in diverse contexts. The speech suggests that in order to be culturally responsive, one must consider the principles of the multicultural checklist (history, power, return, voice, relationship, location, time, reflexivity, and plasticity) which are presented in

follow-up articles.

Hood, S., Hopson, R. K., & Kirkhart, K. E. (2015). Culturally responsive evaluation: Theory, practice, and future implications. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (4th ed., pp. 281–317). Jossey-Bass.

This chapter provides an in-depth history of culturally responsive evaluation (CRE) and includes a discussion of how to integrate CRE practices into nine different stages of the evaluation process; offers examples of CRE conducted in international, Indigenous, and minoritized school and community contexts; and provides an understanding of how validity and rigor are conceptualized and achieved in CRE. Referencing early articles on CRE, the authors provide the following definition: “An evaluation is culturally responsive if it fully takes into account the culture of the program that is being evaluated as well as the needs and cultural parameters of those who are being served relative to the implementation of a program and its outcomes.” Central to this definition is a consideration of values, beliefs, and context. Tables present the key characteristics of a culturally responsive evaluation (Table 12.1), justifications of validity (Table 12.2), and a culture checklist to identify hallmarks of rigor and validity (Table 12.3). The chapter ends with a brief discussion that links the inherent principle of responsibility in CRE to social justice.

Public Policy Associates, Inc. (2015, June). *Considerations for conducting evaluation using a culturally responsive and racial equity lens*. <https://publicpolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/PPA-Culturally-Responsive-Lens.pdf>

This document serves as a practical guide for evaluators interested in conducting culturally responsive evaluations and using evaluation to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The guide contains sections on considerations for evaluators and the composition and qualifications of their teams, the design and approach of the evaluation process, the diversity of an organization’s staff and board, community and cultural contexts (inclusion), and progress toward systems change and racial equity. It also includes an appendix with guiding reflection questions to help teams to prepare to engage in culturally responsive evaluations. The guide also may be helpful for funders interested in understanding the extent to which contracted evaluators apply a culturally responsive approach.

McBride, D. (2018). Culturally responsive evaluation. In B. B. Frey (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation* (pp. 441–444). SAGE Publications, Inc.

This concise encyclopedia entry presents a stronger claim than do other references that culturally responsive evaluation “has a goal of social justice” and “is a tool for achieving social change.” Four main components of culturally responsive evaluation are named and elaborated: culture, context (historical, sociopolitical, community and organizational), responsiveness, and a commitment to social justice. The culturally responsive evaluation process is explained as having five key steps: (1) learn the culture and environment, (2) engage the people in the process, (3) develop culturally relevant evaluation design and tools, (4) conduct the evaluation with the community, and (5) disseminate and advocate. Culturally responsive evaluation is noted as more resource-intensive than other types of evaluation but also more beneficial, particularly for marginalized populations. The entry ends with a brief example of a culturally responsive evaluation process.

Caldwell, L. D., & Bledsoe, K. L. (2019). Can social justice live in a house of structural racism? A question for the field of evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 40(1), 6-18.

This article discusses in depth whether social justice can be achieved in the field of evaluation. The authors posit that because structures are inherently racist, the tool of evaluation is also racist (see House 2017's article on evaluation and racism). Caldwell and Bledsoe define structural racism as the "totality of ways in which societies foster racial discrimination through mutually reinforcing systems of housing, education, employment, earnings, benefits, credit, media, health care, and criminal justice pg. 6." The authors argue that social justice cannot be achieved unless it becomes standard practice within the field itself through internal reflection of the field, and through subsequent behavior modification. The article makes several suggestions about how to encourage the consideration of social justice as well as suggesting a framework for professional behavior modification. This article is considered seminal in 2019 because of its initial callout of racism in the field's history and practice.

Chouinard, J., & Cram, F. (2019). *Culturally responsive approaches to evaluation: Empirical implications for theory and practice*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

This book provides the most up-to-date history of culturally responsive evaluation. The authors note a philosophical shift from cultural competency among evaluators to cultural responsiveness in practice. They define culture and important dimensions of cultural context and then discuss how culture informs and influences evaluation studies in the Indigenous, Western/North American, and international development contexts. The final chapter provides a discussion of the ten dimensions of cultural practice (epistemological, ecological, methodological, political, personal, relational, institutional, axiological, and ontological) and integrates them into a conceptual framework that can be applied across settings.

Neubauer, L. C., McBride, D., Guajardo, A. D., Casillas, W. D., & Hall, M. E. (2020). Examining issues facing communities of color today: The role of evaluation to incite change. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 166, 7-11.

This article discusses the role and place of advocacy in evaluation as a mechanism to incite social change. The authors contend that this is new territory, and that both sponsors of evaluation and evaluators need guidance about, if, when, and how to embrace advocacy. There is a growing understanding that communities, particularly those most impacted, are concerned with social justice and equity, and these aspects often challenge traditional designs and beliefs about implementation in both programming and evaluation. The article provides a useful historical background and provides some frameworks for consideration for social justice evaluation. This contemporary resource is one of the most up-to-date in providing guidance on the pursuit of social justice and equity via evaluation tools, methods, and use.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE AND EQUITABLE EVALUATION

Public Policy Associates, Inc. (2015, June). *Considerations for conducting evaluation using a culturally responsive and racial equity lens.*

<https://publicpolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/PPA-Culturally-Responsive-Lens.pdf>

This document serves as a practical guide for evaluators interested in conducting culturally responsive evaluations and using evaluation to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The guide contains sections on considerations for evaluators and the composition and qualifications of their teams, the design and approach of the evaluation process, the diversity of an organization's staff and board, community and cultural contexts (inclusion), and progress toward systems change and racial equity. It also includes an appendix with guiding reflection questions to help teams to prepare to engage in culturally responsive evaluations. The guide also may be helpful for funders interested in understanding the extent to which contracted evaluators apply a culturally responsive lens.

Expanding the Bench. (2019). *Definition of culturally responsive and equitable evaluation. Change Matrix.* <https://expandingthebench.org/about/terms/>

The Expanding the Bench initiative by Change Matrix and funded by AECF and other philanthropic organizations developed the first working definition of culturally responsive and equitable evaluation (CREE). CREE is designed to help practitioners and theorists to center culture and equity in practice and in theoretical frameworks. The definition of CREE is informed by transformative, culturally responsive, and equitable evaluation approaches and frameworks. Still a work in progress, the definition is considered a focal point for new work in the area.

Anderson, M., Andrews, K., Elam, P., Hilliard, T., & Johnson, L. (2020, March). *Utilization of a culturally responsive and racial equity lens to help guide strategic engagement and evaluation [workshop].* International Conference of the Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment, Chicago, IL, United States.

<https://www.pathlms.com/aea/courses/25161>

This workshop, presented through the *Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment*, was designed to provide background and guidance on the practical use of a racial equity lens when conducting evaluations. In the framework presented, culture and race are important considerations based on the belief that there are critical and substantive nuances that are often missed, ignored, and/or misinterpreted when an evaluator is not aware of the culture of those who are being evaluated. The workshop provided a how-to process, focused on the cultural competencies of individuals who conduct evaluations, how such competencies might be improved, and strategies for doing so.

Mendez, K., & Taniuchi, A. (2020, April 12). *Expanding the Bench week: Culturally responsive and equitable evaluation: What is it and why is it important?* American Evaluation Association.

<https://aea365.org/blog/expanding-the-bench-week-culturally-responsive-and-equitable-evaluation-what-is-it-and-why-is-it-important-by-karla-mendez-alina-taniuchi/>

The AEA 365 blog is one of the first writings about CREE, providing a definition of the framework and articulating why practitioners would want to engage in CREE. AEA addresses

four key areas: (1) how CREE supports better evaluation, (2) what CREE looks like in practice, (3) how to address challenges in applying a CREE approach, and (4) the value of CREE to funders of evaluation. Resources that refer primarily to culturally responsive evaluation are provided.

Ghanbarpour, S., Noguez Mercado, A. P., & Palotai, A. (2020). A language justice framework for culturally responsive and equitable evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 166, 37–47.

In this 2020 *New Directions* volume, Ghanbarpour et al. proposes an evaluation framework centered in language justice, which is defined as “the right to communicate in the language in which one feels most comfortable” (pg. 37). The authors discuss issues related to language equity and oppression and distinguish between language access and language justice. This article is helping evaluators and funders of evaluations that it is simply not enough to provide access to language (e.g., translations), but that having one be understood and valued in the manner in which one understands is true justice. The authors present definitions and principles of language justice and argue that practitioners of CREE must consider this in all aspects of the evaluative practice. The article also provides guidance and examples of how to integrate a language justice framework within evaluation practice.

Lemos, D., & Garcia, D. (2020). Promoting culturally responsive and equitable evaluation with Latinx immigrants. *New Directions in Evaluation*, 166, 80–100.

Lemos and Garcia (both former Leaders in Equitable Evaluation and Diversity [LEEAD] scholars) discuss the Culturally Responsive and Equitable Evaluation framework as it relates to Latinx communities. The authors introduce relevant issues for evaluators to consider when working with Latinx immigrants. Specifically, evaluators must simultaneously address biases that people have toward Latinx immigrants. Part of the *New Directions* volume on CREE, this article discusses how evaluators need to be advocates and supporters for Latinx communities by not shying away from the collaborative process. The authors argue that evaluators need to spend adequate time during the design phase to align their understanding, expectations, and strategies with community desires and context. Lemos and Garcia state that evaluators who work collaboratively with diverse Latinx immigrants should ensure that these perspectives are integrated throughout the process and address unanticipated challenges. This article is one of the first to specifically address CREE and should be considered a representative of the Expanding the Bench initiative.

Expanding the Bench. (2021). *CREE Learning Series*. Change Matrix.
<https://expandingthebench.org/cree-learning-series>

This on-going series includes short videos, and transcripts aimed at, 1) ensuring that there is a shared understanding of Culturally Responsive and Equitable Evaluation (CREE), 2) describing CREE in practice, and 3) making the case for the use of the CREE approach in evaluation. The videos include a variety of speakers including the Expanding the Bench Team led by Change Matrix, evaluators and associates from the Advancing Culturally-responsive and Equitable (ACE) Evaluation Network, and advisors, former scholars, and instructors as well as from the Leaders in Equitable Evaluation and Diversity (LEEAD) Program.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE INDIGENOUS EVALUATION

Chouinard, J., & Cousins, J. B. (2007). Culturally competent evaluation for Aboriginal communities: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation*, 4, 40-57.

The purpose of this qualitative review was to synthesize the empirical literature (at the time) on cross-cultural evaluation in Aboriginal communities, and to begin to address the recognized lack of discussion in indigenous communities about research on culturally competent evaluation. Although several questions guided the review, the following overarching key questions guided the review: (1) what is culturally competent evaluation?, (2) what does a culturally competent evaluation in Aboriginal communities look like?, (3) what methodological practices have been found to resonate in Aboriginal communities; and (4) what gaps are in the literature? The article ends with suggestions for further research in the area, particularly in understanding how the role of relationships in the evaluation context. Although the article is focused Aboriginal communities, it can provide a historical perspective on where CRIE has moved from and towards.

LaFrance, J., & Nichols, R. (2008). Reframing evaluation: Defining an Indigenous evaluation framework. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 23, 13–31.

LaFrance and Nichols discuss the work of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), which developed an Indigenous framework for evaluation. To ground the framework, which was designed to integrate Indigenous and Western evaluation practice, AIHEC engaged a number of focus groups in major regions of the United States. Focus group participants included cultural experts, Indian educators, and evaluators, who discussed how evaluation fits within a cultural framework. The authors summarize the focus group discussions and articulate the key principles of the framework. This article serves to ground the work of LaFrance and Nichols, who have published in this area for a number of years.

Bowman, N. R., Dodge Francis, C., & Tyndall, M. (2015). Culturally responsive Indigenous evaluation: A practical approach for evaluating Indigenous projects in tribal reservation contexts. In S. Hood, R. Hopson, & H. Frierson (Eds.), *Continuing the journey to reposition culture and cultural content in evaluation theory* (pp. 335–360). Information Age.

In this article on culturally responsive evaluation in the context of an Indigenous or tribal government reservation, Bowman et al., emphasize the complexity of research on Indigenous populations, noting that the cultural and linguistic components of Indigenous contexts vary greatly across communities. Using case study examples, the authors provide a framework for co-constructing culturally responsive evaluation design and strategies for evaluating a federally funded program implemented within the context of a tribal government reservation. The authors note the need to replicate culturally responsive evaluations as a means to move toward building a larger body of empirical studies guided by Indigenous evaluation frameworks, theories, and formal policies (e.g., the United Nations Declaration of Indigenous Rights). This is one of the most recent articles to bring culturally responsive Indigenous evaluation (CRIE) to the forefront of evaluation studies.

Cram, F., Kennedy, V., Paipa, K., Pipi, K., & Wehipeihaha, N. (2015). Being culturally responsive through Kaupapa Maori Evaluation. In S. Hood, R. Hopson, & H. Frierson

(Eds.) *Continuing the journey to reposition culture and cultural content in evaluation theory* (pp. 289-313). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

In this chapter, Maori researchers Cram et al, discuss Kaupapa Evaluation, which focuses on centering culture, context, and relationships in evaluation practice designed to enable real and appropriate solutions that ensure Maori well-being. The chapter discusses the impact of respectful dialog across disciplinary and methodological boundaries to ensure understanding of the needs of Maori women. This chapter serves as an example of how evaluation can be conducted with Indigenous culture and communities (as well as gender) at the surface.

Waalaneekweew (Nicole R. Bowman-Farrell, Mohican/Lunaape) (2018). Looking backward but moving forward: Honoring the sacred and asserting the sovereign in Indigenous evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 39, 543–568.

This article focuses on CRIE within the broader field of evaluation and offers an overview and origin story of CRIE prior to colonial or European contact in the United States. Specifically, Waalaneekweew provides an overview of the historical, theoretical, and practical foundations for conducting CRIE in a contemporary evaluation context. The author provides examples of evidence-based models, theories, and resources to connect CRIE to Western evaluation designs as well as concrete strategies for the field of evaluation. This is a foundational article that has helped to situate CRIE within culturally responsive approaches.

Waalaneekweew (Bowman, N. Mohican/Lunaape), & Dodge-Francis, C (2018). Culturally responsive indigenous evaluation and tribal governments: Understanding the relationship. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 159, 17-31.

<https://cncfr.jbsinternational.com/sites/default/files/downloads/Culturally%20Responsive%20Indigenous%20Evaluation%20and%20Tribal%20Governments%20Understanding%20the%20Relationship%20BowmanDodge-Francis-2018.pdf>

This NDE chapter focuses on understanding how culturally responsive indigenous evaluation (CRIE) resources have become more integrated into evaluation literature. The authors speculate that this is due to a number of reasons. First, the number of Indigenous evaluators has increased and second, as well as the number of Indigenous focused projects. The chapter articulates the undergirding of the rise of CRIE by having the reader understand the historical and legal foundations; the design Indigenous-focused approaches and their application; as well as the practical CRIE strategies for strengthening professional practice and building capacities for CRIE. This article is designed to provide the reader an understanding of the ways in which CRIE can be used and under what circumstances. A good article for funders and consumers of CRIE.

University of Toronto Press. (2020). Evaluation in Indigenous contexts. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, (34)3.

<https://journalhosting.ualgary.ca/index.php/cjpe/issue/view/5191>

This journal is a special issue that focuses on evaluation in Indigenous contexts, including tribal communities within North America and Indigenous communities in Australia and New Zealand. The various authors discuss principles and frameworks that relate to and provide examples of CRIE, although CRIE is not necessarily referred to in each chapter. The issue is considered a foundation for the approach and includes prominent authors such as Fiona Cram, Joan LaFrance, and Waalaneekweew/Nicole R. Bowman-Farrell.

EMPOWERMENT EVALUATION

Zimmerman, M. A., Israel, B. A., Schulz, A., & Checkoway, B. (1992). Further explorations in empowerment theory: An empirical analysis of psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20(6), 707–727.

Zimmerman et al.'s paper predates the notion of empowerment evaluation (as cited in Fetterman, 1994). The authors extend a theoretical model of psychological empowerment that includes intrapersonal, interactional, and behavioral components. At the time of the study, it was unique due to its large randomly selected urban and suburban community sample and its focus on differences related to race. The results suggest that one underlying dimension that combines different measures of perceived control may be interpreted as the intrapersonal component of psychological empowerment, as it distinguishes groups by their level of participation in community organizations and activities (behavioral component). This article is important to the empowerment framework since much of future evaluation work is based upon Zimmerman et al.'s work.

Fetterman, D. M. (1994). Empowerment evaluation. *Evaluation Practice*, 15(1), 1–15. doi:10.1016/0886-1633(94)90055-8

This is the inaugural book on the empowerment evaluation framework. Empowerment evaluation focuses on the use of evaluation concepts and techniques to foster self-determination. Fetterman provides communities and organizations with an approach that focuses on improvement, is collaborative, and requires both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. His perspective has been a government staple in terms of funding evaluations, with its emphasis on flexibility and wide application in a variety of sectors, including health, education, business, agriculture, microcomputers, nonprofits and foundations, government, and technology.

Andrews, A.B. (1996). *Realizing empowerment in the evaluation of nonprofit women's services organizations: Notes from the front line*. In D.M. Fetterman, S.J., Kaftarian & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

This is one of the original edited books on evaluation practice that uses an empowerment framework. In this book, evaluators from academia, government, nonprofits, and foundations explore empowerment evaluation to foster improvement and self-determination. The book also focuses on the various contexts in which empowerment evaluation is conducted, ranging from what Andrews refers to as “resistant environments” (in which significant effort is required to move away from passive compliance orientations) to “responsive environments” (which have a tradition of self-determination and community organizing). The contributors also provide the tools and technical understanding needed to address the concerns of self-assessment, self-reflection, and accountability through empowerment evaluation.

Fetterman, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Empowerment evaluation principles in practice*. Guilford.

Fetterman and Wandersman follow up Fetterman's (1994) work with ten principles to guide an empowerment evaluation, and how these principles can be put into practice. Through case studies of a variety of evaluation projects, including community health foundation initiatives,

school district, and corporate programs, the authors articulate these principles. The authors also discuss how empowerment evaluation can be used for program improvement. Finally, the authors also discuss the differences between other participatory evaluation and research approaches.

Fetterman, D. M. (2012). *Empowerment evaluation in the digital villages: Hewlett-Packard's \$15 million race toward social justice*. Stanford University Press.

Fetterman's book is practice-based and focused on the *Empowerment Evaluation in the Digital Villages* program, which was a \$15 million community change initiative designed to address the digital divide in East Palo Alto, East Baltimore, and San Diego. Involving a partnership between Hewlett-Packard, Stanford University, and three ethnically diverse communities, the initiative enabled its constituencies to build their own technology-oriented businesses and to improve their education systems and economic health. While examining this large-scale, multi-site case, Fetterman highlights the potential for empowerment evaluation to build local capacity and sustain improvements within communities. The author provides insight into the key steps in empowerment evaluation by exploring the ways that each of these phases took place in the digital villages. Fetterman presents practice-based evidence on the execution of an empowerment evaluation and provides evaluators with real-world stories and practical advice.

Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S. & Wandersman, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment, evaluation capacity building, and accountability* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

The second edition of one of the seminal books on empowerment evaluation focuses on how the landscape of evaluation has been altered by empowerment evaluation and has spread to a wide range of settings. The book includes discussion of the empowerment evaluation principles, several models and tools to help put empowerment evaluation into practice, reflections on the history and future of the approach, and case studies from a number of different projects in a variety of diverse settings.

Fetterman, D. M., Rodriguez-Campos, L., & Zukoski, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation: Stakeholder involvement approaches*. New York: Guilford Publications.

This 2018 book explores three community involvement approaches: collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation. Each approach discusses how engagement occurs focusing on the role of the evaluator, control and perceived control and actual control, critical friends, etc. This book serves as a guide for evaluators as well as funders who are in the process of deciding the appropriate framework that is responsive to community members and also the needs of the evaluation. There are plenty of examples that help provide context to key features of each approach. Finally, the concluding chapter discusses similarities and circumstances in which the approaches can and should be combined.

Thomas, V.G. & Campbell, P. B. (2020). *Evaluation in today's world: Respecting diversity, improving quality, and promoting usability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Thomas & Campbell's evaluation textbook is seminal in the fact that it is the first evaluation training textbook to be written with an equity-focused and culturally responsive lens. It is unique in that it is written with an eye towards the centering of race. Thomas & Campbell argue that

evaluators need to be culturally competent (they go so far as to say cultural competence is an ethical imperative) and their evaluations need to be culturally responsive. In addition to chapters on traditional topics and issues in evaluation (e.g. ethics, paradigms, planning, questions, design, data collection, analysis, dissemination), the book attends to issues of social justice and social change. Key considerations for the reader are (a) conversations with practitioners and scholars who are working on the ground in evaluation, and (b) real-world case studies that provide examples for the reader on conducting evaluations with a racialized lens.

EQUITY-FOCUSED EVALUATIONS

Bamberger, M., & Segone, M. (2011). *How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations.* UNICEF.

https://www.evalpartners.org/sites/default/files/library/selected/EWP5_Equity_focused_evaluations.pdf

This report, based in the international development sector, provides a comprehensive definition of equity-focused evaluations as “judgment[s] made of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability—and, in humanitarian settings, coverage, connectedness and coherence—of policies, programmes and projects concerned with achieving equitable development results.” According to the authors, an equity-focused evaluation process will elevate the concerns of, and unintended results that affect, worst-off groups. The bulk of the report concerns the preparation for and design and utilization of evaluations that will “provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision making process.” The authors also discuss some common challenges to equity-focused evaluations and strategies to overcome them. The report ends with brief summaries of and links to nine equity-focused evaluations that were supported by UNICEF.

Dean-Coffey, J., Casey, J., & Caldwell, L.D. (2014). *Raising the bar—Integrating cultural competence and equity: Equitable evaluation.* *The Foundation Review*, 6(2), 81–94.

In this chapter, the authors present an equitable evaluation capacity-building (EECB) approach for funders. Noting the role of foundations as producers, sponsors, and consumers of evaluation, the authors call upon foundation staff from all departments to integrate equitable evaluation considerations into their work as a means to help foundations “shed a light on the factors that impede equity, [and] also to analyze and assess interventions, investments, and strategies through a lens of promoting equity.” The proposed EECB approach calls for the development of three readiness competencies among individuals: *awareness* of race, ethnicity, and intersectional identities; *attitudes* based in an awareness of institutionalized and structural barriers to equity; and *actions* to build upon existing equitable evaluation practices and shifts in standard practice to be more equity focused. The authors also call for the development of three organizational capacities: *intentional* and explicit commitments to equity; *integration* of equitable evaluation practices, including collaboration with stakeholders; appropriate resourcing of evaluations in terms of funds, people, time and political will; nuanced understanding of theory, validity and statistical rigor; and considerations of context, fairness, uses of evaluation, and potential harms of evaluation; and *institutionalization* of equitable evaluation beliefs and practices across the foundation. The EECB approach is “neither linear nor finite, but is one in which individual competencies and organizational capacities are overlapping and ongoing in their development”; both are viewed as necessary for building equitable evaluation capacity. The chapter provides guiding questions to help foundations address individual readiness and organizational capacity.

Center for Evaluation Innovation, Institute for Foundation and Donor Learning, Dorothy A Johnson Center for Philanthropy, & Luminare Group. (2017, July). *Equitable evaluation framing paper*. Equitable Evaluation Initiative. www.equitableeval.org

The central premise of this framing paper is that evaluators, especially those who evaluate foundation work on equity, have a moral imperative to contribute to equity. As a means to highlight that “different approaches have different implications for the evaluation questions that get asked and results that can be expected,” the paper notes the ways that foundations focus, advance, and institutionalize their equity work. Included are nine philanthropic evaluation orthodoxies (tightly held beliefs) that must be challenged in equitable evaluation. The paper concludes with a call for equitable evaluation that includes commitment to three principles:

1. Evaluation work is in service of and contributes to equity;
2. Evaluative work can and should answer critical questions about the effect of a strategy on different populations and the underlying systemic drivers of inequity and ways in which history and the cultural context is tangled up in both the structural conditions and the change initiative itself;
3. Evaluative work should be designed and implemented in a way that is commensurate with the values underlying equity work: culturally competent, multi-culturally valid, and oriented toward participant ownership.

Finally, the paper cautions that conducting or supporting evaluations that do not adhere to the above principles risks “reinforcing or even exacerbating the very inequities the change initiative seeks to address.”

Dean-Coffey, J. (2018). What’s race got to do with it? Equity and philanthropic evaluation practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 39(4), 527–542.

Dean-Coffey describes a shift among foundations toward prioritizing equity and directly addressing racism in their own institutions and in their strategies and actions. The author argues that philanthropic evaluators and evaluation staff need to examine how their practices are influenced by racism and as well as the white racial frame that has “long legitimated, rationalized, and shaped racial oppression and inequality in this country.” Dean-Coffey invites evaluation practitioners to reflect on the history of evaluation in philanthropy, particularly that it was brought to the field by wealthy white men who were interested in using evaluation as a means of accountability and demonstrating effectiveness and who held narrow notions of rigor, validity, and objectivity. She highlights that foundations and evaluators have worked together to advance evaluation practice and encourages evaluation that “more fully recognizes context and cultural validity and that explores questions that deepen understanding of historic and present-day structural and systematic barriers to desired outcomes.” Finally, the author argues that evaluation is not objective; rather, it is political but holds promise for yielding meaningful insights and information and can contribute to racial equity if notions of evidence, knowledge, and truth can be expanded.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Development Evaluation. (2019). Better criteria for better evaluation: Revised and updated evaluation criteria. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/evaluation-criteria-flyer-2020.pdf>.

This flyer by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Development Evaluation names six evaluation criteria intended to guide evaluations (particularly in the international context) and two principles for their use. The DAC put forth the first 5 evaluation criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, impact, relevance and sustainability) in 1991, and added the sixth (coherence) in 2019. Key improvements made to the criteria in 2019 are described.

Stern, A. Guckenbug, S., Persson, H., & Petrosino, A. (2019). *Reflections on applying principles of equitable evaluation*. WestEd Justice & Prevention Research Center.
<https://www.aecf.org/resources/reflections-on-applying-principles-of-equitable-evaluation>

Based on their experience with conducting four evaluations sponsored by AECF over a two-year period, the authors discuss assumptions and offer reflections and strategies on how to integrate the principles of equitable evaluation into key steps of the evaluation process: selection of the evaluation team; development of evaluation question, study design, data collection strategies, and protocol and survey; selection of interview and survey participants; data collection and coding; and design, development, and use of the final product. Based on their experience, the authors note that involving stakeholders in defining success for an initiative and the review of data collection tools and final products may be easier than engaging all stakeholders in data collection. Limited budget, timeline, and scope also were identified as potential challenges to an equitable evaluation process.

Equitable Evaluation Initiative (2020). *Equitable Evaluation Framework*TM.
<https://www.equitableeval.org/framework>

The Equitable Evaluation Initiative Framework has become a key framework not only in philanthropy but in federal, state and local agencies. The Initiative's mission is to “grow a sustainable field of leaders who are reimagining the purpose and practice of evaluation to advance equity and expand notions of objectivity, validity, rigor and embrace complexity.” The initiative lays out a framework based on three tenets: “(1) Evaluation work is in service of and contributes to equity; (2) evaluative work should be designed and implemented in a way that is commensurate with the values underlying equity work, and (3) evaluative work can and should answer critical questions.” This is a key reference and resource for all evaluators and philanthropic organizations who are engaged in ensuring equity work.

Equitable Evaluation Initiative (EEI) in partnership with Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO). (2021). *Shifting the evaluation paradigm: The Equitable Evaluation Framework*TM.
<https://www.geofunders.org/resources/shifting-the-evaluation-paradigm-the-equitable-evaluation-framework-1332>

This publication is an updated report on the Equitable Evaluation FrameworkTM (EEF) . It discusses the key principles underlying the framework and identifies prevailing orthodoxies around evaluation that must be challenged. In this expanded version expanded notions of validity and rigor are explored. The second half of the publication highlights learnings and reflections from foundation partners who have worked to translate the EEFTM into practice, which allows for concrete stories about how funders have grappled with mental and organizational changes. Through their examples, themes of readiness, innovation and tolerance for the unknown, engaging in difficult conversations, embracing complexity and mindset shifts are touched upon. The publication ends with a brief discussion of five tensions and sticking points: exercising vulnerability and risk, engaging in purposeful dialogue, defining equity, framing

current evaluation discourse and building internal relationships. This is the most recent framing of the EEI which runs from 2018-2023.

*EEI Acknowledgement: <https://www.equitableeval.org/acknowledgement-attribution>

Van den Berg, R.D., Magro, C., & Adrien, M.H. (Eds). (2021). *Transformational evaluation for the global crises of our time*. Exeter, UK: International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS).

This book came out of the 2019 International Development Evaluation Association Global Assembly and the Third International Conference on Evaluating Environment and Development, both of which focused on the need to transform evaluation for transformational change. Historically, evaluation has been conducted for purposes of accountability. The editors argue that this limited approach has minimized experimentation and created a micro-macro paradox whereby small projects targeting a specific issue are successfully completed with no noticeable changes or shift in the issue at the country or global levels. This book examines what is needed for evaluation to support transformational changes in global crises such as climate change, structural inequality and inequity, economic exploitation and repression, increasing mobility and migration and increased insecurity and unpredictability of the geopolitical and biological worlds. Six sections are dedicated to 1) perspectives that set the stage and describe the urgency of transformational evaluation; 2) experiences with and examples of transformational evaluation; 3) issues of professionalization; 4) themes and cases; 5) approaches and methods; and 6) a discussion of the Prague Declaration of 4 October 2019, which lays out 10 statements about transformational evaluation agreed upon by evaluators, commissioners, parliamentarians and other evaluation users at the conferences noted above.

TRANSFORMATIVE EVALUATION

Mertens, D. M. (1999). Inclusive evaluation: Implications of transformative theory for evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(1), 1–14.

This article contains remarks made by theorist Donna Mertens in her Presidential Address at the 1999 American Evaluation Association. The first half of the address links transformative theory and inclusive evaluation practices that meaningfully involve marginalized groups. Mertens notes, “The transformative paradigm is characterized by placing central importance on the lives and experiences of marginalized groups, such as women, ethnic/racial minorities, people with disabilities, and those who are poor. The evaluator who works within this paradigm consciously analyzes asymmetric power relationships, seeks ways to link the results of social inquiry to action, and links the results of the inquiry to wider questions of social inequity and social justice.” She also contrasts the transformative paradigm’s assumptions about truth, reality, and methodology with those of the post-positivist and constructivist paradigms. In the second half of Mertens’ address, she describes how transformative theory can and should be applied in the determination of program theory, the involvement of diverse stakeholders, and the development of data collection instruments that can facilitate transformative change.

Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 212–225.

In this article, Dr. Mertens argues for the use of mixed methods as a means of ensuring that the various realities of stakeholders are examined and included in evaluations so that no one reality is privileged, and the voices of those whose voices have been traditionally excluded are heard. Most of the article focuses on the four basic beliefs/assumptions of the transformative paradigm: (ontological (nature of reality), epistemological (nature of knowledge and relationships between the knower and the would-be-known), methodological (approach to systematic inquiry), and axiological (nature of ethics). Mertens discusses how mixed-methods approaches can be used in service of these beliefs and how a cyclical model of research allows for community participation at all stages of the research process. She describes the process as having the potential to result in a deep understanding of cultural issues, valid data, and opportunities to tie data to social action.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. Guilford Press.

This is the authoritative reference on transformative research and evaluation. Mertens’ purpose is “to make explicit the underlying assumptions and methodological implications of working from the transformative paradigm, which prioritizes the furtherance of human rights and social justice” and to challenge the status quo. One chapter is dedicated to helping the evaluator to understand the importance of self-awareness and relationships in the evaluation context, while another six chapters concern the design, implementation, and analysis of evaluation studies that adhere to the transformative paradigm.

Mertens, D. M. (2010). Transformative mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 469–474.

In this article, Mertens describes the four key beliefs/assumptions of the transformative paradigm (see above) and provides examples of how each was addressed in an evaluation of a teacher preparation program. This article is different from other references included in this bibliography

in that it provides background on how Mertens came to her work and how she has successfully applied transformative mixed-methods research. In the conclusion, she states, “The transformative paradigm provides me with guidance in terms of clarification of ethics and values and consequent decisions that are related to ontology, epistemology and methodology.” The example provided shows how the application of mixed methods in the transformative paradigm can highlight and address power structures that perpetuate social inequities.

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. (2012). *The transformative paradigm and the social justice branch*. In *Program evaluation theory and practice* (pp. 161–217). Guilford Press.

Mertens and Wilson begin the chapter by proposing the addition of a social justice branch to Alkin’s (2004) evaluation tree, which placed theorists on the utilization, methods, or values branches. The authors state, “There is a significant difference between the Values Branch, which can be used to support social justice evaluations, and the Social Justice Branch, which holds that social justice is the primary principle guiding evaluators’ work.” The authors provide a comprehensive introduction to the transformative paradigm and its underlying assumptions (ontological, axiological, methodological, and epistemological) and highlight the work of other theorists who also belong on the social justice branch. To demonstrate the diversity of approaches within this branch, Mertens and Wilson include examples of studies conducted from various evaluation perspectives, including deliberative democratic, country-led evaluation, critical race theory, Indigenous, culturally responsive, disability and deaf rights, feminist, and transformative participatory.

Mertens, D. M. (2016). *Assumptions at the philosophical and programmatic levels in evaluation*. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 59, 102–108.

In this article, Mertens applies the four key assumptions of the transformative paradigm (as noted above) to the understanding of the nature of a problem and potential solutions. According to Mertens, “The evaluator has an ethical responsibility to engage with stakeholders to examine the assumptions about the problem, solution and evaluation methods in order to increase the potential for social change.” Mertens provides sections on making values explicit (axiological assumption), understanding different versions of reality, often through contextual analyses (ontological assumption), developing relationships (epistemological assumptions), and using evaluation methodology in the service of social justice (methodological assumption). The examples provided, which relate to climate change and sexual violence, illustrate how a transformative approach can provide a clearer picture of the assumptions about the nature of a problem and the design, implementation, and determination of effective solutions.

Mertens, D.M. (2018). *Mixed methods design in evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mertens is arguably one of the key foundational thinkers on mixed methods, and presents mixed methods as a distinct methodology. This book assumes at least a basic understanding of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies and focuses on how to maximally combine them based upon the evaluator’s and *evaluation’s* intention and orientation. The use of mixed methods can be either concurrent or sequential and are particularly well suited for the evaluation of complex or “wicked” problems. Decisions on the most appropriate design will depend on the evaluator’s philosophical assumption. The first chapter of the book differentiates between five philosophical paradigms (positivism/post-positivism, constructivist, pragmatism, transformative, metaparadigm) and associated branches of evaluation (methods, values, use, social justice, dialectical pluralism). Four chapters of the book are dedicated to tasks commonly

completed by evaluators: evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions, development of instruments, systematic reviews, and policy evaluations. Another chapter provides examples of mixed methods used in context-specific evaluation approaches. The last chapter focuses on trends, challenges and advances in mixed methods evaluation.

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. (2019). *Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed). Guilford Press.

This 2nd edition textbook seeks to address the paradigm wars that often plague the field of evaluation thus providing “a broad understanding of the evaluation field” and “the tools necessary to engage in planning and implementing evaluations”. It has become a general reference book for graduate students, faculty, practitioners and commissioners of evaluation. The book is broken into four parts covering the landscape of evaluation; historical and contemporary evaluation paradigms, branches, theories and approaches (not limited to the transformative paradigm, and inclusive of myriad evaluation examples within each paradigm); the planning of evaluations; and implementation in evaluation. Finally, this second edition includes a few additional approaches to evaluation as well as new information on data collection technologies and methods of qualitative coding.

Mertens, D.M. (2020). *Research and evaluation in education & psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, & mixed methods*. (5th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

This textbook is particularly designed for students, practitioners, and evaluators in the disciplines of education and psychology to help them “identify, evaluate and practice good research...in culturally complex communities”. It serves as a primer on evaluation and research design. From the beginning, it situates methodological decisions within philosophical frameworks. After describing four key scientific paradigms and the practice of evaluation, the book turns to research design. The book includes practical chapters on literature reviews, survey methods, sampling, data collection and analysis as well as chapters focused on evaluation design, types and approaches.