

Formal evaluation standards

(Version approved by Board of Directors of Czech Society for Evaluation)

January 2013

1. Utility of evaluation

1.1 Identification of involved parties

Parties affected by the evaluation should be identified and their needs should be taken into account.

1.2 Evaluator's credibility

Persons carrying out the evaluation should be independent and professional, so that the interested parties can accept the evaluation results.

1.3 Gathering of information and its scope

Answers to evaluation questions must be based on undistorted data.

1.4 Interpretation of evaluation findings and recommendation

Perspectives, procedures and values used in interpretation of evaluation findings should be described in detail in final reports. If evaluation includes recommendations, those should to the point, relevant and feasible.

1.5 Comprehensibility and scope of outputs

Evaluation reports should describe the evaluation results, purpose and course in a clear and simple way. The extent and form of outputs should be agreed upon in advance between the evaluator and the contracting authority.

1.6 Delivering outputs in time

Confirmed findings should be presented to the involved parties on regular basis, so that they can use them when it is needed.

1.7 Evaluation impact

Evaluation should be carried out in such a manner that fosters utilization of its findings by the involved parties.

2. Feasibility

2.1 Practical feasibility of evaluation procedures

Evaluation procedures should be designed in such a manner that lowers the risk of gathered information being biased.

2.2 Political feasibility

Evaluation should foresee different positions of the involved parties; the evaluation process should strive for cooperation of the parties and prevent any attempts of those parties to distort or misuse the evaluation findings.

2.3 Cost effectiveness

Evaluation should yield information so valuable that it justifies costs at which the evaluation was carried out.

2.4 Evaluation team

Members of the evaluation team listed in the evaluation bid should remain the same for the whole time for which the evaluation is carried out. If it is necessary to change the evaluation team's composition, the contracting authority should be informed about this fact in advance, and the authority's approval with the changes should be requested.

3. Correctness

3.1 Service-orientation

Evaluation should help identify and satisfy needs of different target groups in an effective manner.

3.2 Formal agreement

Obligations of contract parties taking part in the evaluation (such as the subject matter of the contract, manner and time of its fulfillment etc.) should have a written form.

3.3 Human rights

Evaluation should be designed and carried out in a way that respects and protects human rights and human dignity.

3.4 Interaction between persons

Evaluators should respect human dignity in their interaction with other persons involved in the evaluation to prevent harming of participants of evaluation or their exposure to risk.

3.5 Completeness and fairness

Evaluation should be complete and balanced in recording and assessing strengths and shortcomings of the program which is being evaluated, so that the strengths can be further developed and shortcomings clearly identified and, gradually, eliminated.

3.6 Accessibility of results

The parties involved in the evaluation should make it possible for persons affected by the evaluation to access all the results of the evaluation.

3.7 Clash of interests

Clash of interests should be handled in an open and honest way, so as not to discredit the evaluator and results of his work.

3.8 Financial accountability

Using of financial sources should reflect principles of accountability and should be ethically responsible.

4. Accuracy

4.1 Specification of the subject of evaluation

The evaluator should clearly and precisely describe the evaluated (intervention) program.

4.2 Context description

Besides the (intervention) program itself, the context of this program should be thoroughly examined as well.

4.3 Description of evaluation procedure

Individual evaluation procedures and their purpose should be described so that it is possible to use them repeatedly and to review them.

4.4 Defensibility of information sources

Sources of information used for evaluation should be described and identified so that their adequacy can be assessed.

4.5 Information validity

Methods of data collection used in the evaluation should ensure that the findings of the evaluation correspond to the facts.

4.6 Information reliability

Methods of data collection should ensure high reliability of findings to which they lead.

4.7 Organizing information in a systematic manner

Information gathered, processed and published in the course of the evaluation should be controlled systematically; there should also be a constant effort to eliminate errors.

4.8 Assessing information

If answers to the evaluation questions are based on quantitative or qualitative data, these data should be analyzed in a correct and systematic manner.

4.9 Justifiability of findings

Findings yielded by the evaluation should be justified, so that the involved parties can review and accept them.

4.10 Impartiality of evaluation results' presentation

The way and form in which the evaluation findings are presented should make it impossible to distort the findings due to subjective feelings and interests of some of the involved parties.

4.11 Meta-evaluation

The evaluation should be subject to further evaluation carried out pursuant to these and other standards.