

Appendices

1. Appendix Tables
2. Ten Principles of Effective Evaluation

Appendix Tables

Table A1—Percentage of students and teachers residing in Appalachian states when they attended the Summer Institute

	Students		Teachers	
	N	%	N	%
AL	4	5%	5	8%
GA	10	11%	5	8%
KY	2	2%	1	1%
MD	8	9%	2	3%
MS	4	5%	5	8%
NC	2	2%	1	1%
NY	15	17%	7	11%
OH	17	19%	13	20%
PA	7	8%	3	5%
SC	4	5%	4	6%
TN	5	6%	6	9%
VA	4	5%	3	5%
WV	6	7%	11	17%
Total	88	98%	66	102%

Note: Percentages in this table do not total 100% due to rounding

Table A2—Selected characteristics of student interviewees (n=9)

	N	%
Gender		
Male	3	33%
Female	6	67%
Year Attended		
1997-1998	2	22%
1999-2000	3	33%
2001-2002	3	33%
2003-2004	1	11%
Use of STEM in current occupation		
To a great extent	4	67%
Somewhat	2	33%
Unemployed	3	N/A
Highest level of education completed since attending the Summer Institute		
One or more years of college but no degree	6	67%
Associate's degree	1	11%
Bachelor's degree	0	0%
Some graduate work	1	11%
Advanced degree (Master's or Ph.D.)	1	11%
Ethnicity		
White	8	88%
White and African American	1	11%

Table A3—Selected characteristics of teacher interviewees (n=13)

	N	%
Gender		
Male	6	46%
Female	7	54%
Year attended		
Multiple years	4	31%
1997-1998	1	8%
1999-2000	2	15%
2001-2002	2	15%
2003-2004	4	31%
Number of years teaching experience at time of the institute		
1-5	3	23%
6-15	2	15%
16+	7	54%
Missing data	1	8%
Ethnicity		
White	9	69%
Black or African American	1	8%
Hispanic or Latino	1	8%
Missing data	2	15%

Table A4—First educational institution attended after high school

	Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%
No post HS education	2	5%	1	2%
Community college or Technical Center	8	19%	4	9%
Military Academy	2	5%	0	0%
4-year school	29	71%	37	88%
Total	41	100%	42	99%

Table A5—Highest level of education attained

	High school or less		Some college but no degree		Associate's degree or technical diploma/certificate		Bachelor's degree		Graduate work	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1997& 1998 (n=23)	0	0%	5	22%	1	4%	9	39%	8	35%
1999& 2000 (n=23)	1	4%	5	22%	3	13%	10	43%	4	17%
2001& 2002 (n=16)	3	19%	11	69%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%
2003& 2004 (n=26)	14	54%	11	42%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Total (n=88)	18	20%	32	36%	7	8%	19	22%	12	14%

Ten Principles of Effective Evaluation

1. Evaluators ideally should be involved in systematic inquiry with the reform leaders in the early stages of project conceptualization; in assessing current conditions and capacities and needs for improvement; in identifying the performance gaps and other problems, and in envisioning program designs that seek to close the gaps, solve problems, and meet identified needs.
2. Evaluators should work with project designers and proposal writers to develop a project logic model to ensure that an internally consistent program is designed to respond to the needs and problems identified, with a set of project activities or interventions likely to impact the original conditions, problems, and performance gaps favorably.
3. Evaluators should combine quantitative and qualitative methods and employ a comparative evaluation design where feasible.
4. Evaluators should seek a comprehensive understanding of the important contextual elements of the evaluation. Contextual factors that may influence the results of a study include geographic location, timing, political and social climate, economic conditions, and other relevant activities in progress at the same time.
5. Evaluators should involve all stakeholders in a participatory process that builds future internal evaluation capacity and also communicate their values, assumptions, theories, approaches and analytic methods accurately and in sufficient detail to allow the stakeholders to understand, interpret, and critique their work and evaluation findings.
6. Evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its results in a way that respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
7. Evaluators should seek to ensure that those who bear the burden of collecting data have full knowledge of, and opportunity to use for program improvement, the evaluators' findings, analyses, and recommendations.
8. Evaluators should make explicit their own interests, their clients' interests, and other stakeholders' interests concerning the conduct and outcomes of an evaluation.
9. Evaluators should allow all relevant stakeholders access to evaluative information in forms that respect people and honor promises of confidentiality.
10. Evaluators should make clear to clients when client interests and requests conflict with the obligation of evaluators for objective inquiry, competence, integrity, and respect for people. In these cases, evaluators should discuss the conflicts with the client and relevant stakeholders, resolve them when possible, determine whether continued work on the evaluation is advisable if the conflicts cannot be resolved, and state clearly any significant limitations on the evaluation that might result if the conflict is not resolved. The public interest in professional, objective inquiry and evaluation for the welfare of society should be upheld as a higher value than a particular client's or other stakeholder's interests.

The Academy for Educational Development (AED) is an independent, nonprofit organization committed to addressing human development needs in the United States and throughout the world. As one of the world's foremost human and social development organizations, AED works in five major program areas: U.S. Education and Workforce Development; Global Learning; Global Health, Population and Nutrition; Leadership and Institutional Development; and Social Change. At the heart of all our programs is an emphasis on building skills and knowledge to improve people's lives.

The **AED Center for School and Community Services** is part of AED's U.S. Education and Workforce Development Group. The Center uses multidisciplinary approaches to address critical issues in education, health, and youth development. To achieve its goals, the center provides technical assistance to strengthen schools, school districts, and community-based organizations. It conducts evaluations of school and community programs while striving to provide the skills and impetus for practitioners to undertake ongoing assessment and improvement. The center also manages large-scale initiatives to strengthen practitioner networks and accelerate systems change and uses the knowledge gained from this work to advocate for effective policies and practices and disseminate information through publications, presentations, and on the World Wide Web. In the past 27 years, the Center has undertaken over 125 evaluation, technical assistance, and dissemination projects in 90 cities and 40 states.

In 2005, the Educational Equity Center at AED (EEC) was formed.. The Center is an outgrowth of Educational Equity Concepts, a national nonprofit organization with a 22-year history of addressing educational excellence for all children regardless of gender, race/ethnicity, disability, or level of family income. EEC's goal is to ensure that equity is a key focus within national reform efforts to ensure equality of opportunity on in schools and afterschool settings, starting in early childhood.

AED is headquartered in Washington, DC, and has offices in 167 countries and cities around the world and throughout the United States. The Center for School and Community Services is in AED's office in New York City. For more information about the Center's work, go to the Center's website at www.aed.org/scs or contact Patrick Montesano or Alexandra Weinbaum, co-directors, at 212-243-1110, or e-mail [sweinbau](mailto:sweinbau@aed.org) or pmontesa@aed.org.

Principal Offices

**1825 Connecticut Avenue
Washington DC 20009-5721
Tel: 202-884-8000
Fax: 202-884-8400
www.aed.org**

**100 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10011
Tel: 212-243-1110
Fax: 212-627-0407
www.aed.org/scs**



Academy for Educational Development