

Community Health Solutions
50 Standards for Assuring the Quality of Your Program Evaluation

	Standard	Fully meets standard	Partially meets standard	Does not meet standard	Standard not applicable
	Organizational Commitment				
1	We have commitment from internal leadership to evaluate this program and act upon results				
2	We have commitment from internal staff to evaluate this program and act upon results				
	Program Design Evaluation				
3	Our target population is clearly defined				
4	Our scope of services is clearly defined				
5	There is evidence that our target population needs our services				
6	We have clarified whether our program is proven, experimental, or a combination of both				
7	Our individual outcomes are clearly defined				
8	Our system-level outcomes are clearly defined				
9	Our outputs are clearly defined				
10	Our activities are clearly defined				
11	Our inputs are clearly defined				
12	Our inputs are sufficient to support target levels of activity and output				
13	Our assumptions (program theory) about why the program will work are clearly defined				
	Program Implementation Evaluation				
14	We have identified the major inputs, activities, and outputs required to deliver this program				
15	We have established a system for measuring each major input, activity, and output				
	Program Outcome Evaluation				
16	We have selected one to five major outcomes to evaluate				
17	Each outcome to be measured is important to our audience(s)				
18	Each outcome to be measured is within our sphere of influence				
19	Each outcome to be measured is achievable within the timeframe of the project				
20	Each outcome to be measured is in fact feasible to measure				
	Utility Standards				
21	Stakeholder Identification. We have identified all persons involved in or affected by the evaluation so that their needs can be addressed				
22	Evaluator Credibility. The persons conducting the evaluation are trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation.				
23	Information Scope and Selection. Information has been selected to address pertinent questions about the program and to be responsive to the needs and interests of clients and other specified stakeholders.				
24	Values Identification. The perspectives, procedures, and rationale used to interpret the findings are clearly defined.				
25	Report Clarity. Our evaluation report clearly describes the program being evaluated as well as the findings of the evaluation.				
26	Report Timeliness and Dissemination. Our evaluation results are disseminated to intended users in a timely fashion so as to maximize the utility of the information.				
27	Evaluation Impact. We have planned, conducted, and reported the evaluation in ways				

Community Health Solutions
50 Standards for Assuring the Quality of Your Program Evaluation

	Standard	Fully meets standard	Partially meets standard	Does not meet standard	Standard not applicable
	that encourage follow-through by stakeholders.				
	Feasibility Standards				
28	Practical Procedures. The evaluation procedures are practical enough to keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained.				
29	Political Viability. We have planned and conducted the evaluation with anticipation of various interest groups so that their cooperation may be obtained and any attempts to curtail or bias the results may be averted or counteracted.				
30	Cost Effectiveness. The evaluation is planned to be efficient and produce information of sufficient value so that resources expended can be justified.				
	Propriety Standards				
31	Service Orientation. The evaluation is planned to assist the organization in its efforts to serve the needs of the full range of targeted participants.				
32	Formal Agreements. Obligations of the formal parties to the evaluation have been specified in writing.				
33	Rights of Human Subjects. The evaluation is designed and conducted to respect the rights and welfare of human subjects.				
34	Human Interactions. Evaluators respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with persons associated with the evaluation so that participants are not threatened or harmed.				
35	Complete and Fair Assessment. The evaluation is complete and fair in its examination and recording of strengths and weaknesses of the program so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.				
36	Disclosure of Findings. The full set of evaluation finding along with pertinent limitations are made available to the persons affected by the evaluation and any others with expressed legal rights to receive the evaluation results.				
37	Conflict of Interest. Conflict of interest is dealt with openly and honestly so that it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.				
38	Fiscal Responsibility. The allocation and expenditure of evaluation resources reflects sound accountability procedures and is otherwise prudent and ethical.				
	Accuracy Standards				
39	Program Documentation. The program being evaluated is described and documented clearly and accurately, so that the program is clearly identified.				
40	Context Analysis. The context in which the program exists is examined in enough detail, so that its likely influences on the program can be identified.				
41	Described Purposes and Procedures. The purposes and procedures of the evaluation are described in enough detail, so that they can be identified and assessed.				
42	Defensible Information Sources. The sources of information used in the program evaluation are described in enough detail, so that the adequacy of the information can be judged.				
43	Valid Information. The information-gathering procedures assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the intended use.				
44	Reliable Information. The information-gathering procedures assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for the intended use.				

Community Health Solutions
50 Standards for Assuring the Quality of Your Program Evaluation

	Standard	Fully meets standard	Partially meets standard	Does not meet standard	Standard not applicable
45	Systematic Information. The information collected, processed, and reported is systematically reviewed, and any errors found have been corrected.				
46	Analysis of Quantitative Information. Quantitative information is appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.				
47	Analysis of Qualitative Information. Qualitative information is appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered.				
48	Justified Conclusions. The conclusions reached in the evaluation should be explicitly justified, so that stakeholders can assess them.				
49	Impartial Reporting. Reporting procedures guard against distortion caused by personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation, so that evaluation reports fairly reflect the evaluation findings.				
50	Metaevaluation. The evaluation itself has been formatively and summatively evaluated against these and other pertinent standards, so that its conduct is appropriately guided and, on completion, stakeholders can closely examine its strengths and weaknesses				

Sources: Standards 1-20 developed originally by Community Health Solutions. Standards 21-50 adapted from The Program Evaluation Standards, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, as listed and available in book form at <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/>.