

## Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation Program Evaluation Standards

For more information, please see:

<http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards-statements>, or

Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., & Caruthers, F. A. (2011). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### Utility Standards

The utility standards are intended to increase the extent to which program stakeholders find evaluation processes and products valuable in meeting their needs.

U1: Evaluator Credibility. Evaluations should be conducted by qualified people who establish and maintain credibility in the evaluation context.

U2: Attention to Stakeholders. Evaluations should devote attention to the full range of individuals and groups invested in the program and affected by its evaluation.

U3: Negotiated Purposes. Evaluation purposes should be identified and continually negotiated based on the needs of stakeholders.

U4: Explicit Values. Evaluations should clarify and specify the individual and cultural values underpinning purposes, processes, and judgments.

U5: Relevant Information. Evaluation information should serve the identified and emergent needs of stakeholders.

U6: Meaningful Processes and Products. Evaluations should construct activities, descriptions, and judgments in ways that encourage participants to rediscover, reinterpret, or revise their understandings and behaviors.

U7: Timely and Appropriate Communicating and Reporting. Evaluations should attend to the continuing information needs of their multiple audiences.

U8: Concern for Consequences and Influence. Evaluations should promote responsible and adaptive use while guarding against unintended negative consequences and misuse.

### Feasibility Standards

The feasibility standards are intended to increase evaluation effectiveness and efficiency.

F1: Project Management. Evaluations should use effective project management strategies.

F2: Practical Procedures. Evaluation procedures should be practical and responsive to the way the program operates.

F3: Contextual Viability. Evaluations should recognize, monitor, and balance the cultural and political interests and needs of individuals and groups.

F4: Resource Use. Evaluations should use resources effectively and efficiently.

### Propriety Standards

The propriety standards support what is proper, fair, legal, right and just in evaluations.

P1: Responsive and Inclusive Orientation. Evaluations should be responsive to stakeholders and their communities.

P2: Formal Agreements. Evaluation agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations, and cultural contexts of clients and other stakeholders.

P3: Human Rights and Respect. Evaluations should be designed and conducted to protect human and legal rights and maintain the dignity of participants and other stakeholders.

P4: Clarity and Fairness. Evaluations should be understandable and fair in addressing stakeholder needs and purposes.

P5: Transparency and Disclosure. Evaluations should provide complete descriptions of findings, limitations, and conclusions to all stakeholders, unless doing so would violate legal and propriety obligations.

P6: Conflicts of Interests. Evaluations should openly and honestly identify and address real or perceived conflicts of interests that may compromise the evaluation.

P7: Fiscal Responsibility. Evaluations should account for all expended resources and comply with sound fiscal procedures and processes.

### Accuracy Standards

The accuracy standards are intended to increase the dependability and truthfulness of evaluation representations, propositions, and findings, especially those that support interpretations and judgments about quality.

A1: Justified Conclusions and Decisions. Evaluation conclusions and decisions should be explicitly justified in the cultures and contexts where they have consequences.

A2: Valid Information. Evaluation information should serve the intended purposes and support valid interpretations.

A3: Reliable Information. Evaluation procedures should yield sufficiently dependable and consistent information for the intended uses.

A4: Explicit Program and Context Descriptions. Evaluations should document programs and their contexts with appropriate detail and scope for the evaluation purposes.

A5: Information Management. Evaluations should employ systematic information collection, review, verification, and storage methods.

A6: Sound Designs and Analyses. Evaluations should employ technically adequate designs and analyses that are appropriate for the evaluation purposes.

A7: Explicit Evaluation Reasoning. Evaluation reasoning leading from information and analyses to findings, interpretations, conclusions, and judgments should be clearly and completely documented.

A8: Communication and Reporting. Evaluation communications should have adequate scope and guard against misconceptions, biases, distortions, and errors.

### Evaluation Accountability Standards

The evaluation accountability standards encourage adequate documentation of evaluations and a metaevaluative perspective focused on improvement and accountability for evaluation processes and products.

E1: Evaluation Documentation. Evaluations should fully document their negotiated purposes and implemented designs, procedures, data, and outcomes.

E2: Internal Metaevaluation. Evaluators should use these and other applicable standards to examine the accountability of the evaluation design, procedures employed, information collected, and outcomes.

E3: External Metaevaluation. Program evaluation sponsors, clients, evaluators, and other stakeholders should encourage the conduct of external metaevaluations using these and other applicable standards.