



2019 AES AWARDS *for* **Excellence in Evaluation**

Information on nominations; policies, procedures and practices;
and tips and advice for preparing an award nomination

ABOUT THE AES

The Australian Evaluation Society (AES) is a member based organisation which exists to improve the theory, practice and use of evaluation for people involved in evaluation including evaluation practitioners, managers, teachers and students of evaluation, and other interested individuals. The AES undertakes a range of activities to improve the theory, practice and use of evaluation, including the annual Awards for Excellence in Evaluation.

ABOUT THE AES AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EVALUATION

The AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation are designed to encourage and recognise outstanding contributions to the theory, practice and use of evaluation. Different awards are focused on different areas of the evaluation field such as the conduct of discrete program evaluations, development of evaluation systems, and for evaluation related publications.

The annual awards provide significant peer recognition for leading evaluators, leading evaluations, evaluation best practice and emerging evaluators. Receiving an award offers significant peer recognition that has often proven an important contributor to professional and commercial success, and academic career progression.

The AES views evaluations as a partnership between the commissioner, the evaluator and the participants of the project. The awards recognise the role of all the partners to an evaluation project, not just the evaluators.

The AES encourages all Award recipients to play an active role in promoting excellence in evaluation. Award recipients will be asked to consider ways in which their knowledge and experience may be shared with others, and may be asked to contribute to articles and other promotions about the Award.

View details of AES Award recipients since 1994 at:
<http://www.aes.asn.au/previous-awards-recipients.html>

ELIGIBILITY

A nominee must have been a member of the AES for a minimum period of 12 months prior to the nomination closing date:

- except that a nominee for the Emerging New Talent Award must have been a member at the time of nomination but is exempt from the 12-month minimum membership requirement
- in the case of a group nomination, at least one nominee must meet the 12-month minimum membership requirement.

TIMELINE

AES Webinar on the Award categories and how to apply	Monday 29 April 2019
Nominations close	Monday 1 July 2019
Notification application has been received by the AES	Within three working days of nominations closing
Award winners notified	Mid August
Awards presentation	At the AES International Conference, Sydney 15–19 September 2019

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR A NOMINATION

- The completed and signed *nomination form*.
- The *nomination* (which must not exceed seven [7] pages) and is a summary explanation of why the team, organisation or individual should be given the award. It should include information about the contribution the nominated project, organisation or person has made to attaining the objectives of the award for which the nomination is made. This explanation must also address the relevant assessment criteria and attributes, under each of the headings set out on pp. 6–8, and refer to evidence to support the claims made. Applicants should be confident that the evaluation team/person has not caused any major negative effect on stakeholders or agencies through their evaluation work or products.
- **Supporting evidence**

Evidence to support the nomination should be provided, preferably via a link (URL) to electronic forms of documents (rather than as email attachments). Where relevant, the nomination should also refer to particular locations, e.g. page numbers, in supporting documents. The evidence presented in support of the nomination will demonstrate excellence in its conceptualisation, design, implementation and reporting, along with exemplary professionalism and explicit adherence to the AES Code of Ethics and Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations. In all but the most exceptional cases, evidence in support of the nomination will include statements of support by third parties such as the commissioners of the evaluation and/or representatives of the evaluand.

Webinar on the awards

Nominators are strongly encouraged to attend an AES webinar on the Awards scheduled for Monday 29 April 2019. The webinar will cover the steps involved in the nomination process, the different Awards categories, and how to ensure a complete nomination is submitted.

Webinar details are available from 15 April 2019 at <http://www.aes.asn.au>.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All nominations and supporting documentation are treated as commercial-in-confidence and are confidentially handled and stored, and all copies appropriately destroyed at the conclusion of the awards process by the AES and the Awards Panel judges.

DOCUMENTING AWARD RECIPIENTS' ACHIEVEMENTS

Each award recipient is invited to prepare a 500 word (maximum) document that will be published on the AES website. The document, which will follow a structure to be provided to recipients, will briefly summarise the project/paper/person, and describe the distinctive features of the nomination and how it has contributed to the profession and the discipline of evaluation.

THE EIGHT AES AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EVALUATION

There are eight AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation which may be awarded each year:

1. Evaluation Study or Project Award
2. Evaluation Policy and Systems Award
3. Community Development Evaluation Award
4. Indigenous Evaluation Award
5. Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award
6. Public Sector Evaluation Award
7. Emerging New Talent Award
8. Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation Award

NOTE: A project can be nominated in only one category. If you are unsure as to which category and criteria best fit your project, please email the Awards' Committee chairs Ian Patrick, ian@ianpatrick.com.au or Wei Leng Kwok weileng@wlkconsulting.com.au to seek their advice in confidence.

AES AWARDS DESCRIPTION

AWARD	DESCRIPTION
<p>1 Evaluation Study or Project Award</p>	<p>This award recognises an exemplary evaluation study or project in any field which has made, or has the potential to make, a significant contribution to the practice or use of evaluation in Australasia.</p>
<p>2 Evaluation Policy and Systems Award</p>	<p>This award recognises the development of an exemplary evaluation policy, integrated evaluation system, evaluation program, framework and/ or implementation of evaluation policies, systems, programs or frameworks.</p> <p>The work should be designed to be sustainable; and be undertaken in partnership with clients or users.</p>
<p>3 Community Development Evaluation Award</p>	<p>This award recognises evaluations and evaluation processes of a community development initiative, or an evaluation that, through its processes, has supported community development.</p> <p>For the purposes of this award, community development is considered to be a process of collective effort in which individuals and/or groups act together to effect change in their own life or within their community and the decisions affecting them.</p> <p>The award recognises evaluation work that addresses the needs of specific interest groups and/or those often not included or not effectively engaged in evaluation studies (e.g. culturally and linguistically diverse, Indigenous, youth, women).</p>
<p>4 Indigenous Evaluation Award</p>	<p>This award recognises Indigenous evaluation practice. This includes evaluations led by Indigenous peoples, and/or conducted in partnership with Indigenous peoples. It also recognises evaluation capacity building with Indigenous peoples in Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and Pacifica.</p> <p>Work nominated for the award should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support positive outcomes for the Indigenous communities • promote sound, respectful and appropriate practice of evaluation • engage Indigenous people in evaluation practice, and • strengthen the evaluation capacity of Indigenous peoples. <p>Capacity building may include work in building evaluation capacity, building a culture of evaluation, and/or an awareness and interest in evaluation and evaluation policy development.</p> <p>Nominations are assessed by a panel of Indigenous peers.</p>

AWARD	DESCRIPTION
<p>5 Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award</p>	<p>Initiated by AES member Darrel Caulley, this award recognises the best journal article, conference paper, research paper, undergraduate or postgraduate thesis or other peer reviewed publication in evaluation.</p> <p>To be eligible, the publication must have been first published during the past 24 months.</p>
<p>6 Public Sector Evaluation Award</p>	<p>This award recognises exemplary evaluation work conducted within the Australasian public sector that has been used to effect real and observable changes in policies or programs. It recognises the work of all the partners of the evaluation: those who commissioned it, conducted it and implemented its findings.</p> <p>For the purposes of this award, the Australasian public sector is defined as the executive branch of government (including quasi-autonomous bodies) at the local, state and national levels, or the administrative arm of the judiciary.</p> <p>Nominations for this award must demonstrate that at least one of the following elements was conducted within the Australasian public sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • design of the evaluation and evaluation instruments • fieldwork • data analysis • reporting. <p>Nominations focusing on evaluation policy and/or evaluation systems within public sector agencies will not be considered for this award; they should be submitted under the Evaluation Policy and Systems Award.</p> <p>Work conducted by contract staff employed and managed by a public sector agency is eligible for nomination. Work conducted wholly by external consultants, academics or contractors is not eligible.</p> <p>Nominations will explicitly demonstrate how the evaluation work has created observable changes in public sector policies and/or programs.</p> <p>Nominations will include evidence showing how the changes have occurred as a result of the process of evaluation or as a result of the evaluation's findings. Although the changes need not have occurred immediately, nominations will demonstrate a probable causal link between the evaluation process or products, on the one hand, and the changes in policies and/or programs, on the other.</p> <p>Nominators' assertions about the extent and nature of the changes created by the evaluation must be supported by documentary evidence, including statements from third parties who are familiar with those changes in policies or practices.</p>

AWARD	DESCRIPTION
<p>7 Emerging New Talent Award</p>	<p>This award recognises emerging evaluators who have been working in the field of evaluation for fewer than five years. In this time, they will have made a made a significant contribution to the profession or practice of evaluation and will have demonstrated both quality and effectiveness in their work. Contributions may include evidence of leadership in professional activities or substantial accomplishments in their work.</p>
<p>8 Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation Award</p>	<p>This award recognises an AES member for his/her outstanding career contribution to attaining the objectives of the AES, to evaluation theory and/or practice and to the evaluation profession in Australasia. Contributions must be demonstrated through evidence but not necessarily across all three areas.</p>

AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The awards are judged using three criteria:

1. **Professionalism**
2. **Ethical conduct**
3. **Excellence of the evaluation work**

The first two criteria – professionalism and ethical conduct – mainly apply to the role of the evaluator and/or the evaluation team and must be clearly demonstrated. The principle of excellence is mainly concerned with evaluation practice, theory and products. Excellence is assessed on a scale against the attributes relevant to the category of award.

1. Professionalism

The evaluation team/person demonstrates high professional standards in both evaluation and relevant domains, especially in dealing with challenges presented in their work. Applications should reference statements of applicable professional standards from relevant professional bodies, where appropriate.

2. Ethical conduct

The evaluation team/person demonstrates high standards of ethical conduct, including adherence to the AES Code of Ethics and AES Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations. In particular, nominations will demonstrate, where appropriate, an understanding of the special ethical considerations involved in evaluation work with Indigenous people, and the vulnerability or disempowerment of people in dependent or unequal relationships.

3. Excellence of the evaluation work

The evaluation work (or person) should demonstrate attributes of excellence in ways relevant to the award category (see descriptions for each award above):

- 3.1. Sound use of evaluation theory and approaches
- 3.2. High quality and effective practice in consultation, design, planning, data collection, analysis and reporting
- 3.3. Stakeholders highly satisfied with the evaluation work and its use or impact
- 3.4. Significant contribution to utility and knowledge in the domain in which the evaluation is conducted
- 3.5. Innovative approaches that contribute to, or that have the potential to contribute to evaluation knowledge and practice
- 3.6. Outstanding contribution to the body of evaluation knowledge, for example through education, training, mentoring, writing, speaking on professional issues
- 3.7. Outstanding contribution to attaining AES objects

The attributes of excellence apply to the award categories as outlined in the list below and again in the table on p. 8:

- Evaluation Study or Project Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5
- Evaluation Policy and Systems Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5
- Community Development Evaluation Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5
- Indigenous Evaluation Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5
- Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.4 and 3.6
- Public Sector Evaluation Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5
- Emerging New Talent Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4
- Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation Award – Attributes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6 and 3.7

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- Judges are provided with a summary of nominations and are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest. If a conflict of interest is declared, the judge will not be involved in any deliberations or adjudication relating to that nomination.
- Each nomination is reviewed by at least two judges, based on their experience/skills.
- In the event that the selected judges are unable to agree on the relative merit of a nomination, an additional judge reviews the nomination before a final decision is made.
- In the event that no nominations in an award category meet the required standard, no award will be given in that category.
- Commendations are not given in any category.
- Recommendations are submitted to the AES Board for approval.
- The Board's decisions will be communicated to award recipients prior to formal announcement of the awards at the AES International Conference Dinner.

MAPPING THE ATTRIBUTES OF EXCELLENCE TO THE AWARD

	ATTRIBUTES						
AWARDS	3.1 Sound use of evaluation theory and approaches	3.2 High quality and effective practice	3.3. Stakeholders highly satisfied	3.4 Significant contribution to utility and knowledge in the domain	3.5 Innovative approaches that contribute or have the potential to contribute to evaluation knowledge	3.6 Outstanding contribution to the body of evaluation knowledge	3.7 Outstanding contribution to attaining AES objectives
Evaluation Study or Project Award							
Evaluation Policy & Systems Award							
Community Development Evaluation Award							
Indigenous Evaluation Award							
Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award							
Public Sector Evaluation Award							
Emerging New Talent Award							
Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation Award							

OBJECTS OF THE AES FROM THE CONSTITUTION

- Establish and promote ethics and standards in evaluation practice.
- Encourage advances in the theory and practice of evaluation.
- Provide education and training related to evaluation.
- Provide forums for networking, professional development and the discussion of ideas.
- Increase understanding of evaluation and advocate for quality evaluation.
- Be inclusive of Indigenous and all other cultural perspectives.
- Have governance systems that reflect and incorporate best practice.
- Provide a forum that allows the diverse voices of the community to be heard, including those who commission the evaluations, those who carry them out and the evaluands.
- Other activities consistent with the objects.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How are award recipients expected to promote their work as exemplars of evaluation practice?

The focus of the Awards is to promote good practice and it is expected that recipients of the awards will consider the best ways to promote the good practice acknowledged in the award. Award recipients may be contacted by the AES to discuss ways they could be involved in promoting their work. Some examples might include seminars and workshops; articles and papers in journals; and publication of relevant material on the AES website.

In particular it is encouraged that recipients consider highlighting the following areas of their work as exemplars:

- elements of the evaluation policy or system
- developments in evaluation theory
- the evaluation methodology
- capability development processes
- the evaluation planning
- the processes supporting the utilisation of the report
- the negotiation processes used, or
- challenges and how they were overcome.

It is NOT a requirement that evaluation reports be published. The AES understands that some evaluations may be sensitive and confidential; and in many cases the report may not be the best way of promoting good practice. However, where it is appropriate and the commissioner of the evaluation approves sharing the report, it is quite acceptable to use an evaluation report to promote good practice.

What if there is no relevant Commissioner for this nomination?

It is only expected that the commissioner of the project supports the nomination where:

- a project (study, policy, framework, program) is being nominated for the award and
- a person or organisation, other than the evaluator, commissioned the project.

Is it necessary for the commissioner of the project to support the nomination?

A person or body who commissions a project nominated for an award is a participant in the project and would normally be treated as a party to the award. As such, the commissioner should be asked to support the nomination. If the commissioner of the project is unwilling to support the nomination, the nominee should provide an explanation of the circumstances for consideration by the AES Awards and Recognition Working Group.

What sorts of projects qualify for the Policy and Systems Award?

This award is for organisational efforts to promote and use evaluation within the organisation, or to monitor performance. It might include, for example, a policy requirement to evaluate every program every 5 years; or a program of evaluations over a period of time; or a performance monitoring and evaluation system.

Nominees are encouraged to refer to previous recipients of this award

<http://www.aes.asn.au/previous-awards-recipients.html> to see what sorts of projects may be suitable.

What constitutes an ‘outstanding contribution to evaluation’?

Without limiting what might be considered to be an outstanding contribution, nominees are encouraged to consider the sorts of contributions made by past recipients of the award.

Past recipients have all been active participants for many years on the AES Board or Board Committees, or Conference Committees and have made active contributions to evaluation through one or more of:

- contributions to the body of knowledge
- education or training
- mentoring, writing or speaking on professional issues.

Can an incomplete evaluation, report or paper be nominated?

Work-in-progress is ineligible for AES awards. An evaluation or paper is eligible for nomination when it has been submitted to the commissioning agency at the end of a phase of work.

Can a doctoral or other research dissertation or paper be nominated, and what are the eligibility criteria?

Doctoral or other research dissertations/papers may qualify for one of several awards, including the Best Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award, the Best Evaluation Policy and Systems Award and the Best Evaluation Study Award. Eligibility will depend on the research topic and the particular award criteria. In the case of a thesis or dissertation, all formal requirements for the degree must be satisfied before it can be nominated for an award.

Can we nominate a project that is more than five years old?

The AES Awards generally recognise contemporary evaluation work. Nevertheless, some award nominations may be dependent on the passage of time to demonstrate their overall worth. This is particularly likely for the Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation (ET&S) Award and the Best Evaluation Policy and Systems Award. There is no retrospective time limit on nominations, but the AES Awards and Recognition Working Group is particularly interested in more recent examples of best practice in evaluation and in the continuing significance of an individual’s contributions to evaluation.

Do we need to provide evidence to substantiate our nomination?

Claims made in the nomination must reference evidence to substantiate the claims. Where relevant, statements or claims should be cross-referenced to the specific location (i.e. page number/s or item) in any supporting documentation. Claims made without reference to supporting evidence will not be considered.

What sort of supporting documentation is needed?

All relevant information that may assist the judges in their assessment of the nomination should be provided. Supporting information should be clearly labelled, included in the nomination’s table of contents and explicitly mentioned in the nomination proposal. Supporting information may be included as appendices.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AES AWARDS AND RECOGNITION WORKING GROUP

Role of Chairperson

To lead, co-ordinate and be accountable to the AES Board for the activities of the Awards and Recognition Working Group in contributing to the achievement of the Society's aims.

Specific responsibilities of the Awards and Recognition Working Group

- Identify needs for, and design, awards that will contribute to the achievement of the Society's objects and its strategic priorities.
- Generate interest in the submission of nominations.
- Establish and promulgate criteria by which nominations will be judged.
- Review the quality of nominations in the light of clear and agreed criteria that are consistent with evaluation standards and ethics.
- Make recommendations to the AES Board concerning the recipients of the awards.
- Administer the awards process.
- Manage continuity of the Awards and Recognition Working Group, and succession planning.

Membership of the Awards and Recognition Working Group: composition, appointment, duration

The Awards and Recognition Working Group consists of a number of judges which may vary from time to time, one of whom, in accordance with the Society's Constitution, is approved annually by the AES Board as Chairperson. A judge may fill the role of Chairperson for a maximum of three consecutive years. Membership of the Awards and Recognition Working Group is determined as follows.

1. Nominations will be requested in accordance with a five-year rolling program of membership.
2. A nominee must have been a member of the AES for at least three years.
3. Nominees must be prepared to commit their time to the annual awards determination process (usually around a week of effort each year).
4. Awards and Recognition Working Group members should reflect the diversity of AES members' backgrounds and include, to the extent possible, an appropriate gender balance of representatives from Australia and New Zealand, as well as at least one Indigenous member.
5. In the event that no nominations for membership are received or that none of the nominations meet the above criteria, the Awards and Recognition Working Group and/or the AES Board may co-opt the most appropriate person to join the committee.

How awards are introduced, removed, varied or consolidated

AES Awards can be proposed or varied. All proposals for variation or new categories are considered by the Awards and Recognition Working Group, and submitted to the AES Board for its consideration.



2019 AES AWARDS
for
**Excellence
in Evaluation**

NOMINATION FORM

HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR NOMINATION

Email the completed nomination form along with electronic supporting documents to bill.wallace@aes.asn.au no later than close of business **Monday 1 July 2019**. **Hard copy nominations will not be accepted.**

NOTE:

- Supporting evidence to preferably be provided via a link (URL) to electronic forms of documents.
- Electronic signature(s): You can print out the completed form, have it signed and then scan the signed form to submit via email. Alternatively, use Adobe Reader's digital signature options. The nomination form has been enabled to accept digital signatures.

AWARDS CATEGORY: For which category are you nominating (select ONE only)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Evaluation Study or Project Award | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Evaluation Publication (Caulley Tulloch) Award |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Evaluation Policy and Systems Award | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Public Sector Evaluation Award |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Community Development Evaluation Award | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Emerging New Talent Award |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Indigenous Evaluation Award | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Outstanding Contribution to Evaluation Award |

TITLE OF NOMINATED PROJECT/PAPER/PERSON

NOMINATOR

First name		Surname	
Postal address			
Email address			
Phone		Mobile	

>>> Continue overlea

NOMINEE(S)

Organisation

EVALUATORS

Details of contact person (if different from nominator):

First name

Surname

Postal address

Email address

Phone

Mobile

Names of other members of the project team

Signature

I accept this nomination on behalf of the evaluators

Name:

Signature:



EVALUATION PARTNERS (e.g. Commissioner)

First name

Surname

Postal address

Email address

Names of other evaluation partners

Phone

Mobile

Signature

I accept this nomination on behalf of the evaluation partners

Name:

Signature:



INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The intellectual property in the material submitted with this nomination is owned by

I authorise the release of the material to the judges of the AES Awards on a commercial-in-confidence basis for the purpose of assessing the nomination. I/we agree that, in promoting the Awards, the AES may refer to the existence of relevant material provided the material itself is not disclosed without the authorisation of the owner of the intellectual property.

Name:

Signature:



Date: