



**Awards for Excellence In Evaluation:**  
*Policies, procedures and practices*

**27 November 2008**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	Role of the AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation .....	3
2.0	Objectives of the AES Awards for Excellence In Evaluation.....	3
3.0	Role of the Chairperson of the AES Awards Committee .....	3
4.0	Membership of the AES Awards Committee: composition, appointment, duration.....	4
5.0	How awards are introduced, removed, varied or consolidated .....	4
6.0	Awards timeline and communications strategy.....	5
7.0	The Awards assessment process .....	8
8.0	Detailed outline of the Awards for Excellence in Evaluation .....	8
9.0	The AES Awards assessment criteria.....	8
10.0	Tips and advice for preparing an award nomination .....	8
11.0	Award Nomination Form .....	8
12.0	AES Award winners 1994-2009 .....	9

## **1.0 Role of the AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation**

The AES is the primary professional organisation in Australasia 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. These awards are designed to encourage and recognise outstanding contributions to the theory and practice of evaluation, and are an important indicator of the Society's quality standards.

The AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation provide significant peer recognition for leading evaluators evaluations, and evaluation practice in Australasia (Australia and New Zealand).

The award winners represent the best-in-class for each Award category. Winning an AES Award offers significant peer recognition and, in the past has proven an important contributor to professional and commercial success and academic career progression.

## **2.0 Objectives of the AES Awards for Excellence In Evaluation**

The AES Awards for Excellence in Evaluation are offered annually, to recognise and encourage evaluations, evaluators and evaluation practices that adhere to the principles of excellence, professionalism and ethical conduct, and are demonstrable exemplars of work that is:

- *high quality*
- *leading edge*
- *a contribution to knowledge*
- *effective*
- *equitable, and*
- *sustainable* (the evaluation criteria).

## **3.0 Role of the Chairperson of the AES Awards Committee**

### **General role**

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

### **Specific roles**

With approval from the AES Board and assistance from the Awards Committee, to:

- identify needs for, and design, awards that will contribute to the achievement of the Society's aims 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; and
- manage continuity of the Awards Committee and succession planning.

#### **4.0 Membership of the AES Awards Committee: composition, appointment, duration**

The Awards Committee 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 Committee 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 five 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 Committee 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.
5. In the event that no nominations are received or that none of the nominations meet the above criteria, the Awards Committee and/or the AES Board may co-opt the most appropriate person to join the committee.

#### **5.0 How awards are introduced, removed, varied or consolidated**

AES awards can be proposed or varied either by the Awards Committee after reviewing the awards process, by the AES Board or by AES members. All proposals are considered by the AES Awards Committee, and then submitted to the AES Board, which may seek the views of the AES membership before providing approval.

## **6.0 Awards timeline and communications strategy**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Awards Committee milestone</b>	<b>Reason/Objective/Comment</b>	<b>Communications</b>
<b>30-Jun</b>	Closing date for all award nominations	This date provides sufficient lead time for awards announcement at AES Annual Conference in September	AES Administrator prepares a spreadsheet with all nominations listed against each award category and sends this to the Awards Committee Chairperson
<b>July</b>	Awards Committee Chairperson circulates spreadsheet summary of nominees; awards judges declare any likely conflict of interest; Chairperson allocates the assessment tasks after consultation with Awards Committee; Chairperson advises AES Administrator to dispatch relevant nominations and support material to nominated judges; Chairperson contacts the AES Conference Committee to confirm the programming of the awards presentations; Awards Committee holds a teleconference (more than one if required) to discuss progress and/or finalise the assessment.	Depending on the number of nominations it is desirable to have a mix of judges assessing within each awards category; the Awards Committee attempts to distribute the assessment workload evenly and equitably (by topic / interest / experience).	AES Administrator packages and dispatches each nomination including all support documentation to the nominated awards judges

<b>August</b>	In the event of two judges not agreeing on the merit a specific nomination, a third judge is sent the nomination and the Awards Committee resolves the award by teleconference; Awards Committee Chairperson writes and submits a report on the awards deliberations, including the Committee's recommendations, to the AES Board for approval; following Board approval, the Chairperson advises nominees of the outcomes and arranges the production of certificates and plaques for the successful nominees.	The awards assessment process is auditable and accountable. Successful nominees should be advised as soon as possible following the Board's approval, to enable them to make arrangements to attend the presentation at the AES Conference dinner.	No correspondence or communication with nominees is entered into during the awards assessment process. Following Board approval of the award winners, successful nominees should be advised initially by phone by the Awards Committee Chairperson. All nominees will be advised of the outcomes of their nomination by letter from the Chairperson.
<b>September</b>	The Awards Committee Chairperson and the AES President announce the awards and make formal presentations to the successful nominees at the AES Annual Conference dinner.	The Society's Awards for Excellence should be promoted and highlighted at its major annual event.	Award winners are presented with a certificate scroll and an engraved plaque to a standardised design.
<b>October /November</b>	The Awards Committee Chairperson prepares a summary of the awards results for the AES website and for the EJA. The awards brochure, FAQs and nomination form are edited, submitted to the Board for approval, and produced for the next cycle of awards; members are alerted to the awards by a variety of methods, and encouraged to consider nominating.	Publication of the awards results provides closure to the annual awards cycle and an opportunity to promote the next year's awards. The most common edits involve a change to the date/year for submission; however, there may be a need to revise some of the supporting text or to add additional FAQs. The annual awards brochure and related documentation are subject to approval by the Board.	The first communication promoting the next cycle of AES awards accompanies the publication of awards results. Following Board approval of the awards brochure, FAQs and nomination form, the AES Administrator emails an "Awards alert" email, prepared by the Awards Committee Chairperson, to all AES members and places the relevant documents on the AES website. Hard copies of the brochure are also sent to all members as part of a regular mail-out,

			and distributed at regional AES events until the closing date for nominations. The AES Administrator also sends all members a follow-up e-mail reminder about the closing date in mid-June.
<b>December/ February</b>	The Awards Committee Chairperson sends the EJA editor a "call for nominations" for publication in the next issue of EJA.	This gives AES members several months lead time to consider and prepare a nomination.	This is a short paragraph calling for nominations for the awards and referring members to the information available on the AES website.
<b>May/ June</b>	The Awards Committee Chairperson responds to enquiries from potential nominees.	Experience has shown that potential nominees sometimes have queries about the different awards and/or the process of assessment.	Except under special circumstances at the discretion of the Awards Committee, no extensions of time will be given for submission of nominations.

## **7.0 The Awards assessment process**

- The AES Administrator prepares a summary of all nominations and sends this to the Awards Committee Chairperson.
- The Chairperson notifies the awards judges of the nominations in each award category. Where a judge has a potential conflict of interest in a nomination, he/she should not be involved in any deliberations or adjudication relating to that nomination.
- The Awards Committee Chairperson, in consultation with Committee members, allocates each nomination for review by two judges, based on their experience/skills.
- In the event that the two selected judges are unable to agree on the relative merit of a nomination, a third 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 will not be given in any category.
- The Committee's recommendations are submitted via the AES Executive Committee to the AES Board, for its approval prior to finalisation and any announcement being made. The Committee's recommendations will not be communicated to proposed award recipients prior to the Board's approval.
- Awards winners are announced by the Awards Committee Chairperson and the AES President at the annual AES International Conference dinner.

## **8.0 Detailed outline of the Awards for Excellence in Evaluation**

Details and criteria are on the Awards web page, [here](#).

## **9.0 The AES Awards assessment criteria**

Criteria are given on the Awards web page, [here](#)

## **10.0 Tips and advice for preparing an award nomination**

The following advice is provided to assist in the preparation of an award nomination, and is intended as a general guide. Further questions should be directed to the AES Awards Committee Chairperson.

[Download here.](#)

## **11.0 Award Nomination Form**

[Download Adobe Pdf version.](#)

[Download MS Word version.](#)

## 12.0 AES Award winners 1994-2009

Year	ET & S Award	The Caulley Tulloch Pioneering Prize in Evaluation	Emerging New Talent	Best Evaluation Policy and System Award	The Best Evaluation Study Award.	The Indigenous Evaluation Award	The Community Development Evaluation Award	Commendations	Awards Committee
	Since late 1980s Plaque donated by Anona Armstrong	first donated in 1989, according to EN & C, June 99		formerly <b>Best Public Sector Evaluation Award - Best evaluation systems and methodologies, policies and/or frameworks</b> First awarded 1994	formerly <b>Best Public Sector Evaluation Study Award</b> First awarded 1994	since 2006	since 1999		
	for outstanding contributions to evaluation in Australia	for best and most pioneering published article.		to individual or team that has made a significant contribution to the practice and/or use of evaluation in the public sector.	to individual or team that has made a significant contribution to the practice and/or use of evaluation in the public sector	to recognise policy, project or program evaluations with a significant benefit to indigenous peoples	for evaluations that, in some way, concern youth in Australasia		
<b>to 1994</b>	Stephen Kemmis, Bryan Lenne Jane Hall Jerome Winston Colin Sharp Darrel Caulley								
<b>1994</b>	Assoc Professor John Owen	no award		Evaluation Management Team, NSW Public Works in conjunction with staff from Canberra University	Team lead by Alan Pinder, Evaluating Taxpayer Audit Program of the New Zealand Department of Inland Revenue				Sue Funnell (chair) Dr Judith Aitken, Education Review Office, NZ; Illana McLean, President, AES; Prof Alex Wearing Uni of Melbourne
<b>1995</b>	Rosemary Ince	(Now called <b>Caulley Tulloch Pioneering Prize for Literature in Evaluation</b> ) Yoland Wadsworth, Merinda Epstein &		Terrence Measham, Director & Carol Scott, Co- ordinator of the Evaluation Visitors Research Unit, Power House	No Award				Sue Funnell (chair) Ilana McLean, past president, AES Assoc Professor Andrew Trlin, Massey Uni, NZ; Prof Alex Wearing

		Maggie McGuinness		Museum					Uni of Melbourne
1996	Yoland Wadsworth, Ian Trotman	Patricia Rogers & Gary Hough		DASFLEET, Australian Department of Administrative Services and Corporate Diagnositcs	Technical Quality Evaluation Team, New Zealand Department of Inland Revenue (Team included Prue Oxley, Heather Turner, Valmai Copeland, Fiona Hault, Colin Usherwood, Robyn Pullar)				Sue Funnell (chair) Michael Hill QLD Health Dept; Assoc Professor Martin Putterill, Auckland Uni; Prof Alex Wearing Uni of Melbourne
1997	Assoc Prof Ralph Straton	no award		no award	Team from Australian Bureau of Transport & Communications Economics (Team included Joe Motha, Bogey Musldlak, Seu Cheng, Catarina Williams)				Sue Funnell (chair) Dr Marion Aimes, Dept of Health & Family Services; Michael Hill, QLD Dept of Health; Assoc Professor Martin Putterill, Auckland Un Prof Alex Wearing, Uni of Melbourne
1998	no award	no award		Team from Olympics Roads & Transport Authority	(Two awards) Team from NZ Ministry of Justice (Team included Alison Chetwin, Steve Dunstan, Miriamia Scott, Jennifer Leigh, Mark McCallum) and Peter Bycroft and Ellen Vasiliauskas, Corporate Diagnostics Pty Ltd				Dr Marion Aimes, Dept of Health & Aged Care (Chair); Michael Hill, QLD Dept of Health; Prof Alex Wearing, Uni of Melbourne; Dr Jenny Neale, Victoria Uni, NZ
1999	no award	no award		(Two awards) Australian Taxation Office/Corporate Diagnostics Pty Ltd and	Pamela Williams, KPMG			1999 Evaluation in Community Development - Kathryn Mickell	Elizabeth Barber, University College, ADFA, (chair); Michael Hill, QLD Dept Health;

				Evaluation and Auditing Services Ltd formerly the Evaluation Dept. Queen Mary Hospital, Wellington, NZ					Prof Alex Wearing, Uni of Melbourne; Dr Jenny Neale, Victoria Uni, NZ
2000	(Two awards) Sue Funnell; and Anthea Rutter and Zita Unger as Directors of Strategic Training Evaluation P/L	(Now called the <b>Caulley Tulloch Publication Prize</b> )		(Now called the <b>Public Sector Evaluation Development Award</b> for contributions to the development of evaluation policies, systems, frameworks and/or methodologies within the public sector) Team, Ministry of Social Policy, Wellington, NZ	(Now called the <b>Public Sector Evaluation Study Award</b> for evaluation studies involving the public sector) Robert Curnow, Community Changes			<b>no award</b>	Elizabeth Barber, University College, ADFA, (chair); Peter Bycroft, Corporate Diagnostics; Assoc Professor Neil Russell, Griffith University; Assoc Professor Jenny Neale, Victoria Uni, NZ
2001	No nominatons	Scott Bayley (in EJA award called <b>Caulley-Tulloch Award for Best Journal or Other Publication on Evaluation</b> )		(Now called <b>The Evaluation Development Award: Evaluation Policies, Systems, Frameworks or Methodologies</b> - not restricted to public sector) - Dr Zita Unger, Evaluation Solutions	(Now called <b>The Evaluation Study Award</b> - not restricted to Public Sector) Dr Rick Cummings, Murdoch University and Kath Stephenson, Estill and Associates			2001 Evaluation Study Award - Michael Brooks, Chris Milne, Wendy Hodge, Kerry Hart & Maita Merlene, ARTD, - Jennifer Leigh, Prof. Chris Silagy, Brita Pekarsky, Kath Schofield, KPMG & Monash University	Elizabeth Barber, University College, ADFA, (chair); Peter Bycroft, Corporate Diagnostics; Assoc Professor Neil Russell, Griffith University; Assoc Professor Jenny Neale, Victoria Uni, NZ

2002	Dr Patricia Rogers	no award		No award	ARTD Consultants			2002 Evaluation Study Award - Scott Bayley, Rob Fearnside, John Arnol, John Misiano and Rocco Ruttura, Office of Victorian Auditor-General 2002 Community Development Evaluation Award - Dr Robert Lake & Dr Diana Beere, Qld Police Service	Elizabeth Barber (Chair) and Zita Unger (according to EJA?)
2003	Maggie Jacob-Hoff	Bron McDonald, Patricia Rogers, Bruce Kelford		Julie Rolfe, Victorian Premier's Drug Prevention Council and John Pilla, BearingPoint Australia	Review and Evaluation Unit of the Queensland Police Service (Team included Robert Lake, Angela Richardson, Diana Beere, Ruth Beach and Joe Nucifora)				Jenny Neale, Victoria University of Wellington (Chair); Zita Unger; Paul Chesterton; Kerry Kretzschmar
2004	no award	no award		Anna Johnson and the Queensland Government Community Engagement Division					Jenny Neale, Victoria University of Wellington (Chair); Zita Unger; Paul Chesterton; Kerry Kretzschmar
2005		Glenys Jones, Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania		Bruce Davidson, Noosa Council and Ellen Vasiliauskas, d-sipher	Wendy Searle, Tania Slater, Trish Knagags, Janet November, Christopher Clarke, Ministry of Justice, NZ		Bradley Shrimpton, Centre for Program Evaluation and Mandy McKenzie, Domestic Violence Resource Centre		Jenny Neale, Victoria University of Wellington (Chair); Zita Unger; Paul Chesterton; Peter Bycroft
2006	Associate Professor Dr. Rosalind E. Hurworth	no award		Dr Jessica Dart and Dr. Rick Davies	jointly won by NSW Dept of Education and Training and VL Educational Research and Training		no nominations and no award		Peter Bycroft, Corporate Diagnostics (Chair); Zita Unger; Paul Chesterton; Prue Oxley

2007	Penny Hawkins	No nominations	New Award Bradley Shrimpton	Ms Karen Goltz, Health Promotion/Public Health, Department of Human Services & Prof Yoland Wadsworth, Dr Ani Wierenga and Ms Gai Wilson c/ Youth Research Centre, Melbourne University	The Consortium for the Strategy 2000- 2004 Evaluation at CIRCLE, RMIT (Team included Associate Professor Patricia Rogers, Ms Sue Funnell, Mr John Scougall, Ms Keryn Hassall, Mr Peter Tyler, Associate Professor Gerald Elsworth, Ms Sue Kimberley, and Ms Kaye Stevens)	New Award Dr Inez Dussuyer, Ombudsman Victoria and The Indigenous Project Team	No nominations	2007 The Best Evaluation Study Award, by Dale Miller and Karen Trimmer, Department of Education & Training, WA	Zita Unger (Acting Chair); Paul Chesterton; Prue Oxley; Ellen Vasiliauskas (seconded member)
2008	no award	no award	no award	The Western Sydney Region, NSW Department of Education and Training	The Victorian Department of Primary Industries	Anne Markiewicz and Associates Pty Ltd and the Office of Evaluation and Audit (Indigenous Programs), Department of Finance and Deregulation	no award		Profesor Peter Bycroft (Chair) Professor Brian English; Prue Oxley; Ellen Vasiliauskas
2009	Professor Rick Cummings	Coffey International Development, Jennifer Rush and AusAID	Jessica Kenway	The Centre for Health Policy, School of Population Health, University of Melbourne and the Department of Health and Ageing	Rosemarie Tweedie, Mary Carey, Kim Stewart and Baptist Community Services (NSW and ACT)	no award	no award		Profesor Peter Bycroft (Chair); Professor Brian English; Prue Oxley; Ellen Vasiliauskas