**Program Evaluation Standards**

**Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2010)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Standard** | **Description** |
| **Utility Standards****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****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 andpolitical interests and needs of individuals and groups. |
| F4. Resource Use  | Evaluations should use resources effectively and efficiently. |
| **Propriety Standards****Intended to 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****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****Intended to 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. |

More information about the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation can be found on their website: <https://evaluationstandards.org/program/>
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