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Foreword

Aotearoa New Zealand invests considerable resources in a wide range of policies or programmes intended to promote change for the better in our society and communities. We need to know what those investments achieve, how their results can be improved and how valuable our investment has been. Evaluation is intended to provide answers to those questions.

These draft standards set out expectations for good quality evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand. The core principle underpinning the standards is that of evaluation with integrity, which means that evaluation is done in a way that is:

- respectful of people and relationships
- methodologically responsive and appropriate, and
- credibly and competently done.

The standards are principle-based and do not set out detailed rules or procedures, allowing for differences of application in different areas. They have been developed in the context of the unique culture and environment of Aotearoa New Zealand, with some similarities to evaluation standards developed in other countries.

Evaluation standards make a strong statement about what we all consider high quality, ethical, safe, competent and credible evaluation looks like. This is an important conversation to have among all of those who have a stake in evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

We are committed to ensuring wide and diverse discussion and engagement with those who have a stake in evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand. We invite stakeholders to engage in an ongoing dialogue about evaluation, how it is practiced, and how it can best contribute to society. Stakeholders are invited to apply the draft standards, and give us feedback that we can use in future development of the standards.

These draft standards were developed in partnership by the Families Commission/Social Policy and Evaluation Research Unit (SuPERU) and the Aotearoa New Zealand Evaluation Association (ANZEA). We gratefully acknowledge the generous contribution of time, energy, and creativity by a wide range of contributors across New Zealand, and look forward to the next stages of this dialogue.

This work is a collaborative effort of many dedicated people. Thank you.

We encourage you to read the document and join the conversation and we look forward to your feedback and input.

Dr Gail Kelly
Director Client Services and Sector Change
Families Commission/SuPERU

Kate McKegg
ANZEA Convenor
Executive Summary

1. This document puts forward for discussion, a PROPOSED set of principle-based standards that describe quality evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

2. This is an important discussion for all those involved in evaluation (commissioners, evaluators, participants and users), across the range of sectors (public, private, not-for-profit; mainstream, iwi, Māori, Pacific and other organisations and communities).

3. Embarking on the development of standards is a significant step in both the practice and professionalisation of evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand. The standards make a public statement about what high quality evaluation looks like, and what can be expected.

4. Four principles have been identified to frame the evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand:
   - Whanaungatanga
   - Manaakitanga
   - Methodological responsiveness and appropriateness
   - Credibility and competence

5. Twenty standards, five per principle, have been identified as essential to practicing and achieving high quality evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

A Principle-Based Standards Framework

- **Whanaungatanga**
  - Relationships
  - Whakapapa
  - Accountability
  - Governance
  - Self-determination

- ** Manaakitanga**
  - Care
  - Respect
  - Inclusion
  - Protection
  - Reciprocity

- **Methodological responsiveness & appropriateness**
  - Responsive
  - Systematic
  - Robust
  - Transparent
  - Feasible and prudent

- **Credibility and competence**
  - Evaluative validity and reasoning
  - Multicultural validity
  - Competence
  - Independence
  - Usefulness

6. The approach to developing evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand involved identifying a common set of baseline principles. Broad acceptance that these represent excellence in evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand will be sought.

7. This approach requires deliberation and mutual agreement about how the principle-based standards will be enacted and quality assessed in each evaluation setting, by representatives of those commissioning, undertaking, participating and using the evaluation.

8. The overarching value informing these principles is for evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand to be carried out with integrity. That is, the practices, processes and products of evaluation occur in a manner that is respectful of people and relationships, are methodologically responsive and appropriate, credible and undertaken with competence.

9. If the standards are met, it is anticipated this will contribute to (as illustrated below):
   - high quality and worthwhile evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand
   - policy, organisational and community decision-making, learning, knowledge, knowledge building, capacity development
   - the wellbeing of people and/or the environment.

‘Evaluation’ is used broadly to encompass the range of evaluative activities, including discrete evaluation projects, evaluative monitoring, the production of evaluative information and evaluative knowledge, evaluative learning and evaluation science.
Evaluation with integrity: A principle-based approach to evaluation standards

10. Evaluation has an important role in democratic societies and governance. Evaluation contributes to ensuring public and not-for-profit sector resources are used in the best possible way. Evaluation is also used in the private sector to assist business and philanthropic organisations to achieve the best possible results. Evaluation informs decisions across the government and non-government sectors, which affect the wellbeing of people and the environment of Aotearoa New Zealand now, and into the future.

11. Therefore, evaluation practices, processes and products need to be of the highest quality to ensure trust and confidence in the information, findings, judgments and conclusions, which subsequently inform decisions and actions. Confidence and trust is based on the presumption that those undertaking evaluation are committed to excellence and abide by rules of conduct that protect the public interest. Such rules, expressed as principles, guidelines and/or standards, distinguish a profession and provide licence to practice.

12. The development of standards is recognised internationally as a key feature of evaluation professionalisation. Standards are widely considered to play a role in promoting accountability and enhancing the quality of evaluation practice, processes and products. There is strong evidence that perceptions of quality are critical for people to accept and act on evaluation results.

13. The development of evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand is being co-lead by ANZEA and SuPERU. A working group with representatives from the consultation forums held to date, identified the proposed standards based on feedback from the forums and review of literature.

14. The exposure draft was presented jointly by ANZEA and SuPERU at the ANZEA conference in July 2014. It is being released on the ANZEA and SuPERU websites, with an opportunity for readers to provide feedback. The exposure draft version will be used as the basis for further consultation and gathering of feedback from a range of interested parties, including the public sector, not-for-profit or non-government organisations (NGO) sector, and the wider evaluation community.

15. An important challenge is the use and application of the standards. People are encouraged to apply the standards and feedback their learning to assist with the development of an application guide for use by different parties.
Introduction

1. This document puts forward for discussion, a proposed set of principle-based standards for evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Why are evaluation standards important?

2. Evaluation is part of the democratic process for ensuring that public and not-for-profit sector resources are being used in the best possible way.
3. Evaluation is also used in the private sector to assist business and philanthropic organisations to achieve the best possible results.
4. Evaluation informs decisions across the government and non-government sectors, which affect the wellbeing of people and the environment of Aotearoa New Zealand now, and into the future.
5. Therefore evaluation practices, processes and products need to be of the highest quality to assure trust and confidence in the information, findings, judgments and conclusions informing decisions and actions. Standards are one way of facilitating quality practice and gaining the confidence of users.

Does this affect me?

6. YES! This is an important discussion for everyone involved in evaluation. Embarking on the development of standards is a significant step in both the practice and professionalisation of evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.
7. Standards make a claim about what constitutes high quality evaluation. They are much more than a set of professional or best practice guidelines. In effect, they will constitute an agreed ‘philosophy of evaluation’ in this country. They will emphasise what is considered important and valuable in evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.
8. Therefore, it is important we are all involved in determining:
   - the principles underpinning high quality evaluation practice, processes and products, which in turn outline
   - what is expected of evaluation commissioners\(^2\), evaluators, participants and users.

Will these standards only apply to evaluators?

9. NO. The standards will apply to:
   a. Commissioners
      funders and direct clients of an evaluation.
   b. Evaluators
      all those who undertake ‘evaluation’, e.g. discrete evaluation projects, evaluative monitoring, the production of evaluative information and evaluative knowledge, evaluative learning.
      This includes those with professional experience and training in evaluation, and others who undertake evaluation as part of their work.
   c. Participants
      providers and recipients of the ‘something’ (e.g. programme, service or initiative) being evaluated; members of organisations, iwi, Pacific groups, businesses and communities where the ‘something’ is located and the evaluation is occurring.
   d. Users
      those whose needs are addressed by an evaluation; those making decisions based on the information from an evaluation; those who will be affected by such decisions; and those benefiting from improved knowledge, skills, learning or other actions from an evaluation.

---

\(^1\) Definition from ANZEA’s Evaluation 101 conference workshop, Wellington 2014. Quality, value and importance are considered to be roughly equivalent terms to merit, worth and significance.

\(^2\) Evaluation commissioners are typically the direct clients for an evaluation, who ask for and fund the project and who receive the resulting reports or other products.
Who is leading this process?
10. The ANZEA and SuPERU have formed a partnership to co-lead the development of the standards.
11. To date, an initial workshop was held in November 2013, followed by three forums – a hui Māori, Pacific fono and an open on-line session – over May 2014. Representatives from SuPERU, ANZEA and the three forums, developed the first draft of the standards based on feedback from the forums and review of literature3.

What will the standards achieve?
12. The evaluation standards will provide guidance and outline clear expectations for all those involved in evaluation. If the standards are met, it is anticipated this will contribute to (as illustrated below):
   - high quality and worthwhile evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand
   - policy, organisational and community decision-making, learning, knowledge, knowledge building, capacity development
   - the wellbeing of people and/or the environment.

Why not use standards that have already been developed?
13. The brief is to develop evaluation standards that specifically address the context and culture of Aotearoa New Zealand. The proposed standards draw on local (particularly Māori and Pacific) and international literature focused on evaluation, evaluation standards, and evaluation and research guidelines and ethics. They include elements of evaluation standards that have been developed in other countries.

---

3 Key points from these forums and the literature will be summarised separately.
Why develop evaluation standards?

14. Evaluation has an important role in democratic societies and governance. It assists with identifying the best possible policy options, enhances transparency about values, and often includes those affected by decisions, in assessing the quality of decisions taken on their behalf (Picciotto, 2005). Evaluation is increasingly becoming part of government and non-government (iwi, Pacific, community, not-for-profit and private) organisations that utilise public and private resources to achieve positive outcomes for people and/or the environment.

15. All types of organisations are aiming to be high-performing organisations. This includes becoming “knowledge organisations, [that use] evaluative thinking and inquiry to continuously learn about their environment” and whether what they are doing is working (and how well) (Mayne & Rist, 2006, p. 98). Evaluation can play an important role in providing organisations and communities with learning, information, knowledge and evidence to strengthen their ability to make effective decisions, and provide subsequent accountability for those decisions.

16. Evaluation is part of the public management system supporting government to identify and implement policies and programmes to achieve better outcomes for Aotearoa New Zealand. The evolution of evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand has substantively mirrored developments in the public sector, such as the development of performance management indicators, the focus on outputs, result areas and outcomes (and their linkages), results-based management and managing for outcomes (Lunt, Davidson, & McKegg, 2003).

17. Evaluation in the public sector needs to be well positioned to contribute to government’s work programmes, for example, the Ministry of Social Development’s Investing in Services for Outcomes and the government’s Better Public Services. The first key objective of Better Public Services is to get “better outcomes for New Zealanders [by] mobilising across the public service to tackle the complex and ‘thorniest’ issues”. The second is to “improve the quality, responsiveness and value-for-money of state services” (Morrison, 2014, p. 47). While whole-of-government work programmes will continue to evolve and change, the underlying, enduring themes have been maintaining accountability for outputs with an increasing focus on achieving outcomes, and how best to enable the government sector to contribute to accomplishing these (Morrison, 2014).

18. Given the role (actual and potential) of evaluation, a high level of confidence and assurance about the quality of evaluation practices, processes and products is needed. Activities that inform decisions in the public, or an organisation’s or community’s interest, need to enjoy a high level of trust. This trust is often based on the presumption that those undertaking such activities are committed to living “up to a set of rules of conduct that protect the public interest” (Picciotto, 2005, p. 33). Picciotto argues that it is these rules (principles, guidelines, standards) that distinguish a professional and provide licence to practice.

19. SuPERU and ANZEA share an interest in the quality of evaluation practice. One way to promote good practice is through evaluation standards. Standards play a role in promoting accountability and enhancing the quality of evaluation practice, processes and products. There is strong evidence that perceptions of quality are critical to promoting use of evaluation results (Picciotto, 2005).

20. ANZEA has been mandated by its membership to lead the development of quality evaluation practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. The development of evaluation standards is a key strategic priority for ANZEA, and will complement the development of ANZEA’s evaluator competencies.

21. SuPERU supports good evaluation practice across government, and has been legislatively mandated to set standards for monitoring and evaluation in the social sector.

---

4 See http://www.anzea.org.nz/anzea-evaluation-competencies/
22. The Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor, Professor Sir Peter Gluckman (who is a member of SuPERU’s Advisory Board) has recently been considering and reporting on how “New Zealand’s ministries and agencies might improve their use of evidence in both the formation and evaluation of policy” (Gluckman, 2013, p. 3). He has found “a wide and rather inconsistent range of practices and attitudes toward evidence across government agencies” (p. 3). He has recommended the setting of standards across the whole of government, as one of five steps to enhance the use of evidence in policy formation and implementation. While this recommendation explicitly refers to “obtaining expert scientific advice”, the accompanying discussion includes reference to ‘evaluative science’ and ‘intervention research’. He also refers to the use of evaluation to support longer-term planning and readiness.

23. Another factor contributing to the need for standards is the engagement of non-evaluators (those who do not consider themselves evaluators or are not trained or experienced in evaluation), in undertaking evaluation. This has been highlighted in the broadening of evaluation from discrete projects to ongoing evaluative activities (eg evaluative monitoring, the production of evaluation information and knowledge, evaluative learning) as organisations are responding to, for example, the challenges of “streams of evaluative information” and results-based management systems (Mayne & Rist, 2006).
What is evaluation?

24. There is a range of definitions of evaluation, including what people do as part of everyday decision-making through to large-scale investigations. This project has adopted two complementary descriptions of evaluation, with both emphasising the concept of the ‘systematic’ investigation or determination of ‘quality’ or ‘value’.

Evaluation is ...

25. The Program Evaluation Standards (Yarbrough et al, 2011, p.xxv) describes evaluation as including:
- “the systematic investigation of the quality\(^5\) of programs, projects, subprograms, subprojects, and/or any of their components or elements, together or singly\(^6\)
- for purposes of decision making, judgments, conclusions, findings, new knowledge, organizational development, and capacity building in response to the needs of identified stakeholders
- leading to improvement and/or accountability in the users’ programs and systems
- ultimately contributing to organizational or social value.”

26. The description from ANZEA’s Evaluation 101 Workshop adds:

The process and product of reaching robust, defensible evaluative conclusions logically derived from evidence is what distinguishes evaluation from many other activities such as research, audit, decision-making methodology, monitoring, rich description, policy analysis, and the like. These activities may include evaluative components but often do not. On the other hand, evaluation always focuses particularly and intentionally on the quality, value and importance of things.

What is unique about evaluation as a discipline is that it requires the systematic determination (reaching evaluative conclusions) of quality, value and importance\(^7\). At the end of an evaluation process, an evaluation needs to be able to say whether something is any good, or not, and why.

---

5 ‘Quality’ is used to encompass ‘terms that denote value [including] merit, worth, importance, and significance’ (p.xxv).

6 ANZEA similarly describes evaluation as the systematic determination of the quality, value and importance of something. The ‘something’ could be a project, programme or policy, an initiative, organisation or artefact; it could relate to personnel or organisational performance; or something similar. The AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators also adds proposals, technology, research, theory and evaluation.

7 Quality, value and importance are considered here to be roughly equivalent terms to merit, worth and significance.
Purpose, role and use of evaluation

27. There are diverse views on the primary purpose of evaluation, and whether the purpose of evaluation extends beyond its immediate purview, for example:
- informing decisions about improvements
- whether public, organisational, iwi, Pacific, philanthropic or community resources are being used in the best way (value-for-money)
- organisational learning
- knowledge building
- capacity development.

For some, the purpose of evaluation is to support positive outcomes for people and/or the environment.


“Based on differences in training, experience, and work settings, the profession of evaluation encompasses diverse perceptions about the primary purpose of evaluation. These include but are not limited to the following: bettering products, personnel, programs, organizations, governments, consumers and the public interest; contributing to informed decision making and more enlightened change; precipitating needed change; empowering all stakeholders by collecting data from them and engaging them in the evaluation process; and experiencing the excitement of new insights.”

29. Despite the diversity, one thing that the AEA Guiding Principles states evaluators share in common (which also applies to evaluators in Aotearoa New Zealand) is that they “aspire to construct and provide the best possible information that might bear on the value of whatever is being evaluated” (American Evaluation Association, p. 1).

What are evaluation standards?

30. In evaluation (and other disciplines), principles, guidelines and standards are terms that are not clearly delineated and are often used interchangeably. Bob Picciotto (2005, pp. 30-31) provides a description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Oxford English Dictionary</th>
<th>Additional comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>A proposition serving as the foundation of belief or action</td>
<td>Commonly perceived as aspirational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>A general rule or piece of advice</td>
<td>Frequently intended as recommendations that do not take precedence over the judgment of experienced practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>A thing serving as a recognized example or principle to which others conform or others should conform or by which accuracy or quality of others is judged</td>
<td>Preferred term for mandatory norms, accompanied by enforcement or certification mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A principles-based approach to evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand

31. In Aotearoa New Zealand (as in all countries), evaluating across different contexts and cultural settings is inescapable. This provides a challenge to developing and applying a common set of standards. Similarly, quality evaluation means different things to people with their different roles and needs as commissioners, evaluators, participants and users of the evaluation.

32. Therefore the approach to developing evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand has been to identify a common set of baseline principles and seek broad acceptance that these represent excellence in evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

33. This approach will require deliberation and mutual agreement about how the principle-based standards will be enacted and quality assessed in each evaluation setting, by representatives of those commissioning, undertaking, participating and using the evaluation.

34. The standards do not specify particular practices (methodologies, methods), processes or products that should be undertaken or delivered. The standards may be met in different ways using the range of evaluative practices, processes and products as appropriate. Their application will require responsiveness and judgment in each evaluation setting.

Kaitiakitanga of the standards

35. The kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and future development of the standards will be discussed as part of the consultative process. The hui Māori raised the importance of a process for ensuring the integrity and intent of the values and principles underpinning the standards.

36. The intention is for the standards to be widely used and applied on a voluntary basis. They are not a precursor to an enforcement regime or the implementation of certification mechanisms.

37. Promoting the use and application of the standards will be a joint effort of SuPERU and ANZEA.

When do the standards apply?

38. The standards will apply across the range of evaluative activity (as described earlier), including:

- discrete projects e.g. evaluations of pilot programmes, formative or summative evaluations
- ongoing evaluative activities, e.g. evaluative monitoring, producing evaluative information and knowledge, facilitating evaluative learning.

39. It is proposed that the standards will be applied to evaluation where public, organisational or community resources are being used to meet human and/or environmental needs. This is illustrated in the following diagram.
The proposed standards framework

40. Four principles have been identified to frame the evaluation standards for Aotearoa New Zealand:
   - Whanaungatanga
   - Manaakitanga
   - Methodological responsiveness and appropriateness
   - Credibility and competence

41. The core value underlying these principles is for evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand to be carried out with integrity. That is, the practices, processes and products of evaluation occur in a manner that is respectful of people and relationships, are methodologically responsive and appropriate, credible and undertaken with competence.

42. The principles and accompanying standards are not mutually exclusive or discrete. The following diagram illustrates the interconnectedness of the four principles surrounding the core value of ‘evaluation with integrity’.

43. Māori language has been used for two of the principles as these terms more fully capture and describe the principles, and to locate the standards in Aotearoa New Zealand. Whanaungatanga and manaakitanga (and other terms used) are intended to provide guidance for all who practice evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand, across the range of contexts in which evaluation is occurring (public, not-for-profit, private, organisational and community) and the methodological approaches that may be employed.

Principle-based standards

8 The inclusion of Te Reo Māori (Māori language) has been guided by the roopu that convened hui Māori during May 2014 to discuss the development of evaluation standards.
The proposed evaluation standards

44. Twenty standards, five per principle, have been identified as essential to practicing 'evaluation with integrity', achieving quality evaluation and contributing to wellbeing in Aotearoa New Zealand. They are listed in the following diagram. A series of statements defining each of the 20 standards follows.

A Principle-Based Standards Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whanaungatanga</th>
<th>Manaakitanga</th>
<th>Methodological responsiveness &amp; appropriateness</th>
<th>Credibility and competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Relationships</td>
<td>- Care</td>
<td>- Responsive</td>
<td>- Evaluative validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whakapapa</td>
<td>- Respect</td>
<td>- Systematic</td>
<td>- and reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accountability</td>
<td>- Inclusion</td>
<td>- Robust</td>
<td>- Multicultural validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Governance</td>
<td>- Protection</td>
<td>- Transparent</td>
<td>- Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-determination</td>
<td>- Reciprocity</td>
<td>- Feasible and prudent</td>
<td>- Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 The order of the principles and standards do not imply any ranking of importance. Rather they build on each other to support, for example, self-determination and usefulness. Nor are they intended to specify or express a preference for a particular evaluation methodology or methods.
First principle: Whanaungatanga\textsuperscript{10,11}

Whanaungatanga is about building and maintaining meaningful relationships. It is based on interconnectedness and nurturing. Relationships are with people as individuals, as collectives and as members of communities, and in relation to other living and inanimate entities, and the environment. It involves establishing connectedness and engagement in culturally appropriate ways.

a. **Relationships**

Honest, respectful and mana enhancing\textsuperscript{12} relationships (individual and collective) are built and maintained with the range of people, organisations and communities\textsuperscript{13} involved in and affected by the evaluation.

b. **Whakapapa**

Clear and transparent communication about the genesis and purpose of the evaluation is provided by the evaluation commissioner and evaluator. This includes:
- roles and responsibilities
- interests and values
- scope and boundaries
- the risks, benefits and outcomes of the evaluation for participants and users.

c. **Accountability**

The accountabilities of the evaluation commissioner, evaluator, participants and users to each other, and to their respective organisations and communities is identified, acknowledged and negotiated at the beginning and throughout the evaluation.

d. **Governance**

Governance of the evaluation is negotiated between those who have the authority in the context of the evaluation. This includes the evaluation commissioners, the evaluator and those with authority in the organisations and/or communities where the evaluation is taking place.

e. **Self-determination**

The rights, worldviews, aspirations and desires of the evaluation participants and their communities are respected in the evaluation process. This includes guardianship (kaitiakitanga) of knowledge and resources. The evaluation aims to contribute tangible positive outcomes for participants and their communities.

\textsuperscript{10} The drafting of this principle and the standards was informed by the following works: AEA, 2004, Bishop, 2005, Health Research Council, 2014, Moewaka Barnes, 2010, Rangahau, 2014, The Pūtoaroa Writing Group, 2004, along with the feedback from the forums (refer Appendix one).

\textsuperscript{11} It is important to acknowledge that the descriptions of this and other Māori concepts are limited. To learn more (including their research and evaluation implications) refer to, for example, work by Russell Bishop, Fiona Cram, Hekei Moewaka Barnes, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, www.rangahau.co.nz and Te Ara Tīkanga (Health Research Council, 2010). More information may be included with later versions of the standards.

\textsuperscript{12} Mana-enhancing (behaviour) is the expression of manawatūtanga (hospitality, kindness) to others (Winiata, n.d.). It is a practice, a way of engaging with others that cares for the spiritual, emotional, physical and intellectual dimensions of a person (Royal, 2006) (from http://www.anaea.org.nz/anaea-evaluation-competencies/).

\textsuperscript{13} Communities includes iwi, hapū, whānau, Pacific communities and other ethnic groupings.
Second principle: Manaakitanga

Manaakitanga is about hospitality and kindness. It is based on cultural and social responsibility, and involves reciprocity of kindness, respect and humanity. It is about ‘caring for’ and ‘taking care with’ people – ensuring that the mana (dignity) of everyone is upheld. In evaluation and research, it involves acknowledging the importance of indigenous philosophy, values, concepts and protocols (concepts of cultural sensitivity, cultural safety and/or cultural inclusion), and negotiating individual and collective rights and protections regarding privacy and confidentiality.

f. Care

The practices, processes and products of evaluation uphold the mana (dignity) of all those involved in evaluation (people, organisations, communities). This includes:
- respectful, accessible and appropriate engagement
- consideration of the context(s) and culture(s) in which the evaluation is taking place
- respectful and ethical treatment of information
- mindfulness regarding the potential impact of the results of an evaluation.

g. Respect

The dignity, inherent value, wisdom, knowledge, skills and experience of all those involved in an evaluation is respected.

h. Inclusion

The interests, values, concepts and cultural protocols important to the evaluation commissioner, participants and users are acknowledged and their inclusion negotiated at the beginning and throughout the evaluation.

The implications of cultural, ethnic, religious, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation and other such differences, and any inequities are understood and accounted for throughout the evaluation.

Appropriate advice is sought (e.g. organisational and/or knowledge experts, elders, community representatives, advocates).

i. Protection

The evaluation commissioner, evaluator and participant organisations and/or communities identify and adhere to the appropriate ethical guidelines for the evaluation. This includes addressing issues of:
- cultural safety
- confidentiality
- privacy
- informed consent
- the identification and management of potential risks or harms to individual participants, their organisations and/or communities.

j. Reciprocity

Participants’ contributions of information, knowledge, resources and time are valued, respectfully and appropriately recognised. The evaluation aims to ensure all those involved benefit in some tangible way from the evaluation.

14 The drafting of this principle and the standards was informed by the following works: AEA, 2004; Cram, 2009; Health Research Council, 2014; Māori Dictionary, 2014; Rangahau, 2014; Sīākau, 2008; The Tuakiaetia Writing Group, 2013; Te Tauri a Whiri / ta Oso Māori, 2009, along with the feedback from the forums (refer Appendix one).
Third principle: Methodological responsiveness and appropriateness

Methodology is about how people gain knowledge about the world. Methodology is a way of acting, thinking and speaking that occupies a middle ground between methods and philosophical issues. Responsive and appropriate methodology is contextually and culturally appropriate, ‘fit for purpose’, and produces sound, defensible information and judgments.

k. Responsive

The methodology and methods [design] are appropriate for the negotiated purpose(s) of the evaluation, and information needs of the commissioner and other users. They enable the key evaluative questions to be answered within the available timeframes and resources. The design is appropriate to the context of the commissioner, and the context and culture(s) of the evaluation participants, their organisations and communities.

l. Systematic

All aspects of the evaluation are carried out in a systematic manner, including design (which includes the development of evaluative questions and criteria), gathering and collation of information, analysis and synthesis, evaluative reasoning, and reporting of evaluation findings, judgments and conclusions.

m. Robust

The design, data collection and analytical components of the evaluation are rigorous to the extent required and agreed, and appropriate to the context and intended use of the evaluation. The information gathered is accurate, and the results are data-informed, warrantable, contextually and culturally valid and credible, and defensible. The process of the evaluation is logical, traceable and documented, and can be audited.

n. Transparent

The interests and values informing the purpose, design, evaluative questions and criteria are explicit. The role and positioning of the evaluator is transparent. The strengths and limitations of the design and any other factors affecting the evaluation are clearly specified. Commissioners and other users of the evaluation can easily understand the evaluation process, results and how these were arrived at.

o. Feasible and prudent

There are sufficient resources available to undertake the evaluation and address the key purposes and evaluative questions. The evaluation is carried out prudently, that is, efficiently and producing information of sufficient value for the resources allocated.

15 The drafting of this principle and the standards was informed by the following works: AES, 2013; ANZEA, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Schwandt, 2007, Turner, 2013, Yarbrough et al., 2011, along with feedback from the forums (refer Appendix one).

16 This is an abbreviated quote from Thomas A. Schwandt (2007, p.193). He describes methodology as “a theory of how an inquiry should proceed. It involves analysis of the assumptions, principles, and procedures in a particular approach to inquiry (that, in turn, governs the use of particular methods)” (2007, p.193).
Fourth principle: Credibility and competence\textsuperscript{17}

Credibility is about the trustworthiness of evaluation findings, judgments and conclusions and whether the results are contextually and culturally meaningful. Competence is about the evaluator and the evaluation. Credibility and competence are also about whether the evaluation is useful, that is, it enables process use and builds evaluative capacity, as well as produces results that contribute to making a meaningful difference.

p. **Evaluative validity and reasoning**

   The evaluation findings, judgments and conclusions [the results] are sound, cogent, well grounded and logical. The evaluative reasoning clearly links the results to the information and analyses (the evidence), the evaluative criteria of quality (merit, worth, importance and/or significance), and any appropriate warrants.

q. **Multicultural validity**

   The evaluation findings, judgments and conclusions are accurate and trustworthy across the range of the cultural contexts of the evaluation.

r. **Competence**

   The evaluation is carried out by people who have knowledge, abilities, skills, experience and credibility appropriate to the evaluation brief. These include evaluation and methodological expertise, and contextual and cultural knowledge. Both the evaluation commissioners and evaluators have the appropriate professional evaluation competencies for their roles in evaluation. The evaluation is effectively managed and delivered within the negotiated timeframe and resources. An appropriate internal or external accountability process (a meta-evaluation) is carried out, using these and other applicable standards.

s. **Independence**

   The independence of the evaluation and evaluator is negotiated at the beginning of the evaluation. The evaluators’ abilities and warrant to exercise independence of thought and decision-making, given any organisational and/or community roles and responsibilities, or conflicts of interest, is clarified. The final version of the findings, judgments and conclusions of the evaluation are determined by the evaluator, and are not amended without their consent. The integrity of the evaluation is upheld during use and reporting of the results.

t. **Usefulness**

   The evaluation is used by commissioners and other users to contribute to decisions and actions that benefit participants, their organisations and communities. The evaluation process contributes to building the capacity, including the evaluative capacity of those involved in the evaluation.

\textsuperscript{17} The drafting of this principle and the standards was informed by the following works: AES, 2013, ANZEA, 2011, Kirkhart, 2010, Schwandt, 2007, Turner, 2013, Yarbrough et al., 2011, along with feedback from the forums (refer Appendix one).
Applying the standards

45. An important challenge is the use and application of the standards. A guide will be developed for their application as part of the consultation process. People are encouraged to apply the standards and feedback their learning to assist with the development of the application guide as feedback on this draft is considered.

46. The standards are to be applied in conjunction with other relevant good practice and ethical conduct guidelines. Existing evaluation, research and ethical guidelines (including Māori and Pacific ethical frameworks), and detailed standards such as The Program Evaluation Standards, provide guidance on how to give effect to the principles contained in these standards and ensure methodological rigour (refer to the Bibliography).

47. It is envisaged that the application guide will:
- include a section or focus that enables easy application by each role – commissioner, evaluator, participant and user
- outline guidance for the application of each principle and its group of standards across the practices, processes and products of evaluation
- similarly provide guidance to their application across the evaluation journey, as illustrated in the following diagram.

An Applied Principle-Based Standards Framework

Further guidance may be prepared for:
- Commissioner
- Evaluator
- Participants
- Users

Whanaungatanga
- Relationships
- Whakapapa
- Accountability
- Governance
- Self-determination

Manaakitanga
- Care
- Respect
- Inclusion
- Protection
- Reciprocity

Methodological responsiveness & appropriateness
- Responsive
- Systematic
- Robust
- Transparent
- Feasible and prudent

Credibility and competence
- Evaluative validity and reasoning
- Multicultural validity
- Competence
- Independence
- Usefulness

Evaluation Journey: Manage, define, frame, describe, understand causes, synthesise, report and use

The evaluation journey phases are aligned to those developed by Better Evaluation

http://betterevaluation.org
Next steps

48. SuPERU and ANZEA seek feedback on these draft standards, released on both the SuPERU website (www.nzfamilies.org.nz) and the ANZEA website (www.anzea.org.nz). Feedback is sought on the content and application of the draft standards. Questions for consideration in providing feedback are provided on the websites.

49. An indicative plan for consultation and final development of the standards is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| July – November 2014| - Communication and engagement with Government commissioners and research and evaluation teams; NGOs, iwi and Pacific organisations; and wider evaluation community  
- Publication of exposure draft on web sites (ANZEA and SuPERU) |
| December 2014 – February 2015 | - Integration of all feedback  
- Revision of standards  
- Development of outputs for commissioners, evaluators, NGOs / communities (in their range of roles as commissioners, evaluators, participants and users) |
| March – April 2015 | - Publication on websites  
- Other publications / papers developed |
| May – July 2015     | - Joint seminar(s) & workshops (ANZEA & SuPERU) |
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