CES Guidelines
for Ethical Conduct

1. COMPETENCE

Evaluators are to be competent in their provision of service.

1.1   Evaluators should apply systematic methods of inquiry appropriate to the evaluation.

1.2   Evaluators should possess or provide content knowledge appropriate for the evaluation.

1.3   Evaluators should continuously strive to improve their methodological and practice skills.

2. INTEGRITY

Evaluators are to act with integrity in their relationships with all stakeholders.

2.1   Evaluators should accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge.

2.2   Evaluators should declare any conflict of interest to clients before embarking on an evaluation project and at any point where such conflict occurs. This includes conflict of interest on the part of either evaluator or stakeholder.

2.3   Evaluators should be sensitive to the cultural and social environment of all stakeholders and conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to this environment.

2.4   Evaluators should confer with the client on contractual decisions such as: confidentiality; privacy; communication; and, ownership of findings and reports.

3. ACCOUNTABILITY

Evaluators are to be accountable for their performance and their product.

3.1   Evaluators should be responsible for the provision of information to clients to facilitate their decision-making concerning the selection of appropriate evaluation strategies and methodologies. Such information should include the limitations of selected methodology.

3.2   Evaluators should be responsible for the clear, accurate, and fair, written and/or oral presentation of study findings and limitations, and recommendations.

3.3   Evaluators should be responsible in their fiscal decision-making so that expenditures are accounted for and clients receive good value for their dollars.

3.4   Evaluators should be responsible for the completion of the evaluation within a reasonable time as agreed to with the clients. Such agreements should acknowledge unprecedented delays resulting from factors beyond the evaluator's control.

MAY
1996

CANADIAN   EVALUATION   SOCIETY