

# On evaluation quality standards: A List

## Description

[Tweet](#)

The beginnings of a list. Please suggest others by using the Comment facility below

### Normative statements:

- **DFID** Evaluation Quality Assurance templates for [Entry level](#) and [Exit level](#). Entry level refers to TORs or evaluation plans, Exit level refers to draft evaluation reports. Circa **2011**.
- [USAID Evaluation Policy](#), January **2011**. See Section 4 on Evaluation practices, which lists 6 quality criteria
- American Evaluation Association's PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS. [Available online in Summary Form](#). The full text is Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., and Caruthers, F. A. (**2011**). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: [Sage](#)
- [Quality Standards for Development Evaluation](#), DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, OECD, **2010**
- [Quality control in the evaluation reports](#), EuropeAID Co-operation Office, **2006**. (Note: a quality rating is given by the EC to every final evaluation report.)
- [Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#), UN Evaluation Group, **2005**
- [Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#), UN Evaluation Group, **2005**
- UNICEF's [Evaluation Standards](#), based on those also used by AEA above, developed by the American Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (AJCSEE), **undated**
- [UK Evaluation Society Good Practice Guidelines](#), **undated**

### Standards for specific methods (and fields):

- [The CONSORT Statement](#) is intended to improve the reporting of a randomized controlled trial (RCT), enabling readers to understand a trial's design, conduct, analysis and interpretation, and to assess the validity of its results. It emphasizes that this can only be achieved through complete transparency from authors. **2010**
- The [TREND statement](#) – Transparent reporting is crucial for assessing the validity and efficacy of these intervention studies, and, it facilitates synthesis of the findings for evidence-based recommendations. Therefore, the mission of the Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Nonrandomized Designs (TREND) group is to improve the reporting standards of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions – **2009**
- [Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance on undertaking reviews in health care](#). Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, **2009**
- [Methodology checklist: Qualitative studies](#), National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, UK, January **2009**
- [Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A framework for assessing research evidence A Quality Framework](#), by Liz Spencer, Jane Ritchie, Jane Lewis and Lucy Dillon National Centre for Social

Research, UK Cabinet Office, 2003

## Meta-evaluations:

- [Are Sida Evaluations Good Enough? An Assessment of 34 Evaluation Reports](#) by Kim Fors, Evert Vedung, Stein Erik Kruse, Agnes Mwaiselage, Anna Nilsson, Sida Studies in Evaluation 2008:1 See especially Section 6: Conclusion, 6.1 Revisiting the Quality Questions, 6.2 Why are there Quality Problems with Evaluations?, 6.3 How can the Quality of Evaluations be Improved?, 6.4 Direction of Future Studies. **RD Comment:** This study has annexes with empirical data on the quality attributes of 34 evaluation reports published in the Sida Evaluations series between 2003 and 2005. It BEGS a follow up study to see if/how these various quality ratings correlate in any way with the subsequent use of the evaluation reports. Could Sida be persuaded to do something like this?

## Ethics focused

- Australasian Evaluation Society
  - [Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations](#) , 2010
  - [Code of Ethics](#), 2000
  - [Policy on the application of the Code of Ethics](#), 2000

## Journal articles

- [Assessing Quality in Applied and Educational Research: A Framework for Discussion](#), by John Furlong, Alis Oancea, 2008
- [Evaluation Standards in an International Context](#), Love & Russon, New Directions for Evaluation, 2005

## Checklists:

- [Evaluation checklists](#) prepared by the Western Michigan University , covering Evaluation Management, Evaluation Models, Evaluation Values and Criteria, Metaevaluation, Evaluation Capacity Building / Institutionalization, and Checklist Creation

## Other lists:

- See also the European Evaluation Association's lists of:
  - [Evaluation Standards of National and Regional Evaluation Societies](#) and
  - [Evaluation Standards of International and Supranational Organisations](#)

## Category

1. Evaluation quality standards

## Tags

1. meta-evaluation
2. quality
3. standards

**Date**

23/06/2026

**Date Created**

26/09/2011

**Author**

admin