



## Commission Guidelines for Evaluation – some reflections

Peter Van Humbeeck, SERV, UA, ICW, VEP, 21 february 2014

## **►** What is it (not)?

Sociaal-Economische Raad van Vlaanderen

 Evaluation policy guidelines vs. policy evaluation guidelines



## Strong points

- 1. Ambitious programme
- 2. Organisational roles and structure
- 3. Careful balance
- 4. Definition/purpose of evaluations
- 5. Broad scope
- 6. Utilization of results + closing the policy cycle
- 7. Quality instruments
- 8. Transparency
- 9. Evaluation criteria
- 10.Learning



## Comments and questions

- 1. Open process? transparency vs. participation
- 2. Quality of stakeholder consultations?
- 3. Screening? Ambition?
- 4. Evaluation criteria: distributional/social issues?
- 5. Components final report: recommendations?
- 6. Cf. system: individual level?
- 7. Cf. system: policy towards member states?
- 8. Regulatory fitness initiative?
- 9. Role SG?
- 10. Other comments?



Please assess the evaluation report in terms of your judgements as to how positively or negatively it met each criterion specified below:	Very posit	ive	Very negative		
1. Meeting needs: The evaluation report adequately addresses the requests for information formulated by the commissioners and corresponds to the terms of reference					
2. Relevant scope: The rationale of the programme, its outputs, results, impacts, interactions with other policies and unexpected effects have been carefully studied					
3. Open process: The interested parties – both the partners of the programme and the other stakeholders – have been involved in the design of the evaluation and in the discussion of the results in order to take into account their different points of view					
<b>4. Defensible design:</b> The design of the evaluation was appropriate and adequate for obtaining the results (within their limits of validity) needed to answer the main evaluative questions					
<b>5. Reliable data</b> : The primary and secondary data collected or selected are suitable and reliable in terms of the expected use					
<b>6. Sound analysis:</b> Quantitative and qualitative data were analysed in accordance with established conventions, and in ways appropriate to answer the evaluation questions correctly					
<b>7. Credible results:</b> The results are logical and justified by the analysis of data and by suitable interpretations and hypotheses					
<b>8. Impartial conclusions:</b> The conclusions are justified and unbiased					
<b>9. Clear report:</b> The report describes the context and goal, as well as the organisation and results of the programme in such a way that the information provided is easily understood					
<b>10. Useful recommendations:</b> The report provides recommendations that are detailed enough to be implemented					
In view of the contextual constraints bearing on the evaluation, the evaluation report is considered to be:					