

# Metaevaluation revisited, by Michael Scriven

## Description

[Tweet](#)

An [Editorial](#) in [Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation](#), Volume 5, Number 11, January 2009

In this short and readable paper Michael Scriven addresses three categories of issues that arise about meta-evaluation: (i) exactly what is it; (ii) how is it justified; (iii) when and how should it be used? In the following, I say something about all three—definition, justification, and application. He then makes seven main points, each of which he elaborates on in some detail:

1. Meta-evaluation is the consultant's version of peer review.
2. Meta-evaluation is the proof that evaluators believe what they say.
3. In meta-evaluation, as in all evaluation, check the pulse before trimming the nails.
4. A partial meta-evaluation is better than none.
5. Make the most of meta-evaluation.
6. Any systematic approach to evaluation—in other words, almost any kind of professional evaluation—automatically provides a systematic basis for meta-evaluation.
7. Fundamentally, meta-evaluation, like evaluation, is simply an extension of common sense—and that's the first defense to use against the suggestion that it's some kind of fancy academic embellishment.

## Category

1. Uncategorized

## Tags

1. meta-evaluation

## Date

02/05/2026

## Date Created

05/06/2009

## Author

admin