



Evaluation Glossary of the FOPH

Thomas Widmer* and Herbert Brunold**, 16 October 2017

* University of Zurich, Department of Political Science

** Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), Evaluation and Research Service

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Terms of evaluation and evaluation management.....	2
3. Alphabetical table of terms (index).....	7
4. Further reading	9

1. Introduction

The Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) applies a utilization-oriented and participative evaluation approach, which contributes to provide the respective addressees and other interested parties with relevant and dependable evidence for taking decisions. This glossary serves the internal and external partners of the Evaluation and Research Service at the FOPH. It is intended to facilitate the understanding of a selection of terms specific to evaluation and to contribute to a terminological clarification in the specific working context. The selection of terms is deliberately narrow to ensure the clarity and expedience of the glossary in everyday work practice. Naturally, this means that many likewise relevant terms are not listed. In this respect, the existing more comprehensive coverage of the subject should be pointed out; particularly the literature listed in further reading.

The glossary has been compiled by Thomas Widmer (University of Zurich, Department of Political Science) and Herbert Brunold (FOPH, Evaluation and Research Service) with the involvement of staff members of the Evaluation and Research Service.

2. Terms of evaluation and evaluation management

The following glossary is arranged in five thematic sections relevant for the working context.

1. Instruments of knowledge acquisition in the context of public administration
2. Evaluation types in the FOPH
3. Evaluation focus in the chain of effects
4. Assessment basis and evaluation criteria
5. Selected instruments for the conduct of evaluation

1. Instruments of knowledge acquisition in the context of public administration		
Term (E/G/F)	Definition	Explanation, specifically in the context of the FOPH
monitoring Monitoring monitorage / monitoring / suivi	Monitoring describes a continuous observation of a characteristic over a period of time with the aim to identify corresponding changes.	Monitoring data often constitute an important basis for evaluations. In the area of competence of the FOPH, epidemiological data and data on health-related behavior play a particularly crucial role.
government research Ressortforschung recherche de l'administration	Government research refers to the scientific activity commissioned by the federal administration, which aims at describing, explaining, understanding and/or predicting.	«Government research is research initiated by the Federal Administration because it needs the results of this research to fulfil its tasks.» [Art. 16 para. 1, RIPA, SR 420.1] In the FOPH, a distinction is made between research and evaluation, which are each realized with specific competences and modalities. As a complement to monitoring and evaluation, the government research in the FOPH has the function to provide (new) knowledge for policy and strategy development and for the implementation of measures in the health area. The government research in the FOPH primarily involves contract research and contributions to third parties. It is practice-oriented and usually interdisciplinary.
audit Audit audit	Audit refers to the examination of actions within (public) institutions with regard to their regularity, their legality, and their economic efficiency.	In general, audits are embedded in a context of a supervisory function. At the FOPH, this primarily relates to the insurance supervision. Further, the FOPH can be subject to audits by third parties (such as the Federal Audit Office).
performance measurement Leistungsmessung mesure des performances	Performance measurement designates the recording of the performance of (public) institutions with regard to an objective.	In the FOPH, the terms performance measurement or output measurement are used. Repeated performance measurements using quantitative and qualitative data establish the basis to measure progress. Measuring performance and progress are the responsibility of the competent unit and primarily serve the purpose of project reporting.
evaluation Evaluation évaluation	Evaluation refers to a research-based service to systematically and transparently assess an object, such as a strategy, law, program, project, measure, etc.	Prerequisites for a systematical and transparent assessment are established through the provision of information bases (quantitative and qualitative data) and evaluation criteria. An evaluation assesses the merit (value independent of context) and/or the worth (value specific to context) of an object with the intention to provide a basis for its improvement (formative evaluation) or to draw a balance (summative evaluation). Evaluations should simultaneously be useful, feasible, proper, and accurate (see meta-evaluation). Namely, they respect ethical principles and contribute to the common good.

2. Evaluation types in the FOPH		
Dimension of localization	Evaluation type / Definition	Explanation, specifically in the context of the FOPH
steering location of an evaluation Ort der Steuerung einer Evaluation lieu du pilotage d'une évaluation	<p>Distinction between an evaluation <i>steered</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – within an organization or project under consideration (self-evaluation / Selbstevaluation / auto-évaluation) or – outside of an organization or project under consideration (heteronomous evaluation / Fremdevaluation / évaluation hétéronome). <p>A <i>self-evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is steered by the actors responsible for the object of evaluation.</p> <p>A <i>heteronomous evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is steered by actors outside of the object of evaluation.</p>	<p>As part of the steering of an evaluation decisions are made regarding the intended use location and the execution location of an evaluation. Central decisions relating to the steering of an evaluation concern the aim, purpose and questions of the evaluation as well as the determination of applicable evaluation criteria.</p> <p>The decision on the steering location of an evaluation significantly influences the credibility of the evaluation among specific addressees.</p> <p>At the FOPH, the steering of an evaluation generally involves the units responsible for the object of evaluation within and outside of the FOPH.</p>
execution location of an evaluation Ort der Durchführung einer Evaluation lieu de la réalisation d'une évaluation	<p>Distinction between an evaluation <i>executed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – within an organization or project under consideration (internal evaluation / interne Evaluation / évaluation interne) or – outside of an organization or project under consideration (external evaluation / externe Evaluation / évaluation externe). <p>An <i>internal evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is executed within an organization or project under consideration.</p> <p>An <i>external evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is executed outside of an organization or project under consideration.</p>	<p>The decision on the execution location of an evaluation is made as part of the steering of an evaluation.</p> <p>Hybrid forms are possible and quite common: In a particular case, evaluations can be partly internally and partly externally executed.</p> <p>In the FOPH practice, the location of assessment determines if a hybrid form is either designated as an internal or an external evaluation.</p>
(intended) use location of an evaluation Ort der (intendierten) Nutzung einer Evaluation lieu de l'utilisation (envisagée) d'une évaluation	<p>Distinction between an evaluation intended to be <i>used</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – within an organization or project under consideration (formative evaluation / formative Evaluation / évaluation formative (aussi évaluation endoformative)) or – outside of an organization or project under consideration (summative evaluation / summative Evaluation / évaluation sommative (aussi évaluation recapitulative)). <p>A <i>formative evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is performed with the intention to trigger learning processes, to thereby lead to an improvement of the object of evaluation.</p> <p>A <i>summative evaluation</i> is an evaluation, which is performed with the intention to draw a balance in order to provide proof of performance and/or effectiveness of the object of evaluation to third parties.</p>	<p>The decision on the intended use location of an evaluation is made as part of the steering of an evaluation.</p> <p>The intended use location describes, in other words, the function (or the purpose), which should be served by an evaluation. The determining factor is, whether an evaluation should contribute to an improvement of the object or provide the basis for accountability (proof of success). While combinations of formative and summative evaluations are frequently encountered, they pose problems owing to the two objectives of the evaluations possibly competing with one another. A clear determination of the main function of an evaluation is imperative.</p> <p>Formative and summative evaluation can be illustrated by the following example: «When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative; when the guests taste the soup, that's summative.» (Bob Stake, as cited in Scriven 1991: 169)</p>
temporal location of an evaluation Zeitliche Verortung einer Evaluation temporalité de l'évaluation	<p>Distinction, if an evaluation refers to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a future object (prospective evaluation / prospektive Evaluation / évaluation prospective, ex ante evaluation / ex ante Evaluation / évaluation ex ante), – a current object (accompanying evaluation / begleitende Evaluation / évaluation in itinere) or – a «realized or completed» object (retrospective evaluation / retrospektive Evaluation / évaluation rétrospective, ex post evaluation / ex post Evaluation / évaluation ex post). <p>A <i>prospective evaluation</i> (also ex ante evaluation) is an evaluation concerned with the assessment of a future strategy, program, project or another future object.</p> <p>An <i>accompanying evaluation</i> is an evaluation concerned with the assessment of a current strategy, program, project or another current object.</p> <p>A <i>retrospective evaluation</i> (also ex post evaluation) is an evaluation concerned with the assessment of a realized or completed strategy, program, project or another «realized or completed» object.</p>	<p>Evaluations are generally accompanying or retrospective studies.</p> <p>Retrospective evaluations can refer to objects that have not yet been completed by covering what has occurred so far.</p> <p>Examples for prospective evaluations are regulatory impact assessments (RIA), sustainability assessments (SA) or health impact assessments (HIA).</p>

3. Evaluation focus in the chain of effects		
Term (E/G/F)	Definition	Explanation, specifically in the context of the FOPH
input Input input / moyens / intrants	Resources (means), in whichever form, used for the realization of a strategy, program, project or another object.	The input of a strategy etc. also includes the concept underlying a strategy (the strategy in terms of the paper). A concept evaluation would therefore also be an evaluation of the input.
process Prozess processus	Connection of activities and events associated with the realization of a strategy, program, project or another object.	The distinction between what is part of the process and what is not depends on how the process is delimited from the upstream (input) and downstream (output, outcome, impact) level of effect as well as from the context. Depending on the definition of the system boundaries, the process can vary in extent (as in the case of strategies, which exhibit a multilevel structure or which are federally implemented).
output Output produits / extrants	Services and products directly rendered and created through a strategy, program, project or another object and directed towards the addressees.	The direct addressees often constitute the <i>target group(s)</i> (Zielgruppe / groupe cible) of an object. The target group, however, may also be reached indirectly, e.g. through multiplier programs.
outcome Outcome réalisation / effet direct	Changes (immediately) occurring among the direct addressees of a strategy, program, project or another object.	Evaluations assessing the outcome also require data based information on the output to ensure causal attribution.
impact Impact impact	Changes caused by a strategy, program, project or another object occurring among persons, groups, organizations or other objects beyond the direct addressees.	Evaluations assessing the impact also require data based information on the output and outcome to ensure causal attribution.
context Kontext contexte	Surroundings, in which an evaluation object (such as a strategy, program, project, etc.) is embedded and which influences the form, the development and the preconditions for effects of an object. In other words, it comprises of a constellation of external factors, which may influence an evaluation object.	The context must always be taken into consideration in evaluations — regardless of the focus being on one or multiple elements of the chain of effects. Only in this way is it possible to provide a balanced assessment.

4. Assessment basis and evaluation criteria		
Term (E/G/F)	Definition	Explanation, specifically in the context of the FOPH
relevance Relevanz pertinence	Importance of a strategy, program, project or another object with regard to resolving existing problems.	Relevance may be considered as a fundamental question of an evaluation or an assessment criterion. Relevance is a measure of importance of an evaluation object (e.g. policy / strategy / program / measure) with regard to solving a problem. The determination of relevance is primarily based on identifiable needs and interests of stakeholders. The needs and interests may change over time.
expedience / fit for purpose Zweckmässigkeit opportunité	Utility of a strategy, program, project or another object with regard to resolving existing problems.	Expedience / fit for purpose may be considered as a fundamental question of an evaluation or an assessment criterion. Expedience / fit for purpose focuses on the extent of suitability of an object (such as a measure) to solve a specific problem or to achieve a fixed objective, respectively. The criteria to assess the suitability are: conformity of objectives, adequacy, practicability and utility. A weak effect of an object may not only be attributed to insufficient implementation, but also to a lack of expedience / fit for purpose.
coherence Kohärenz cohérence	Internal harmony of the individual elements constituting a strategy, program, project or another object.	Coherence may be considered as a fundamental question of an evaluation or an assessment criterion. In the FOPH, a distinction is made between internal and external coherence. Internal coherence focuses on the consistency of objectives, means and measures. External coherence, by contrast, focuses on the consistency of actions with respect to external activities.

4. Assessment basis and evaluation criteria		
effect Wirkung = Effekt = Auswirkung effet	Difference between a state, which can be causally attributed to an intervention, and an unaffected state.	
effectiveness / efficacy Wirksamkeit = Effektivität effectivité / efficacité	Extent to which the intended effects of a program, project or another object actually occur.	Effectiveness / efficacy can be considered as a fundamental question of an evaluation or an assessment criterion. A distinction is made between effectiveness (under real conditions) and efficacy (under ideal conditions). The degree of goal attainment is a measure to determine the effectiveness or efficacy.
economy Wirtschaftlichkeit rentabilité / économie	Ratio between the resources invested and the achieved results.	Economy may be considered as a fundamental question of an evaluation or an assessment criterion. In the broader sense, economy includes <i>efficiency</i> (Effizienz / efficience), <i>cost-effectiveness</i> (Kosten-Wirksamkeit / coût-efficacité), <i>cost-utility</i> (Kosten-Nutzwert / coût-utilité) and <i>cost-benefit</i> (Kosten-Nutzen-Relation / rapport coût-utilité (aussi rapport coût-bénéfice)). While costs are taken into account as a monetary value, - effectiveness is expressed in units of effectiveness (such as the number of prevented infections with a disease), - utility is expressed in units of utility (such as 'Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALY)') and - benefit is expressed as the monetary value of the benefit. In the narrow sense, economy describes productivity, i.e. the ratio of input and output.
sustainability Nachhaltigkeit durabilité / viabilité / pérennité	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Durability of a characteristic; in the context of evaluation, often the durability of an effect, concerning the persistence (or transience) of an ascertained effect. 2. Multidimensional assessment criterion, which integrates criteria for social, economical and ecological dimensions. 	The term sustainability may be susceptible to misunderstanding due to its two meanings. Its use should always involve an explanation of the term. If sustainability is intended to signify «durability», the proper term «durability» should be used.

5. Selected instruments for the conduct of evaluation		
Term (E/G/F)	Definition	Explanation, specifically in the context of the FOPH
program picture Programmbild image du programme	Visual presentation of an evaluation object (such as a strategy, program, project, etc.), which allows the program designers to visualize the intended connections and sequence of effects. The visual presentation shows how the respective activities occur and how they take effect.	Program picture is a generic term. There is a multitude of different terms used for program picture (partly associated with a specific conception); most prominently « <i>effect model</i> » (Wirkungsmodell / modèle d'effets), « <i>logic model</i> » (logisches Modell / modèle logique) and « <i>program theory</i> » (Programmtheorie / théorie du programme) Program pictures may be designed as causal models (including intervention and causal hypotheses) or as process schemes. In that regard, a clarification should always be provided. The FOPH commissions the development of « <i>effect models</i> » including the determination of the corresponding indicators of effect and accompanying explanatory reports.
meta-evaluation Meta-Evaluation méta-évaluation	Meta-evaluation is an evaluation of an evaluation, i.e. a systematic and transparent assessment of one or multiple evaluations based on the criteria <i>utility</i> (Nützlichkeit / utilité), <i>feasibility</i> (Durchführbarkeit / faisabilité), <i>propriety</i> (Korrektheit / déontologie) and <i>accuracy</i> (Genauigkeit / precision) as well as further relevant criteria.	At the FOPH, the term meta-evaluation is primarily used for the quality review of externally commissioned draft evaluation reports by the Evaluation and Research Service. In addition to the extensive quality review of evaluation project reports, the FOPH, if needed, also commissions externally conducted meta-evaluations to specific problems. The criteria utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy are specified in the SEVAL-Standards 2000 (Widmer/Landert/Bachmann 2000); the SEVAL-Standards 2016 contain further criteria.

5. Selected instruments for the conduct of evaluation		
<p>evaluation management Evaluationsmanagement gestion de l'évaluation</p>	<p>Evaluation management ensures the process management and quality assurance of an evaluation project.</p>	<p>The guidelines for evaluation in the federal government (Widmer 2005) contain information on the promotion and assurance of quality with regard to specific phases. They are based on the SEVAL-Standards 2000 (Widmer/Landert/Bachmann 2000) and support the evaluation management at the FOPH.</p> <p>The utilization-oriented and participative evaluation approach of the FOPH shapes the design of the seven process phases of evaluation management at the FOPH:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Needs assessment and setting of priorities / Bedarfserhebung und Prioritätensetzung / Identification des besoins et priorisation 2. Planning / Planung / Planification 3. Formulation of terms of reference / Ausarbeitung des Pflichtenhefts / Elaboration du cahier des charges 4. Competitive commissioning / Auftragsvergabe im Wettbewerb / Mise au concours et adjudication du mandat 5. Accompanying evaluation activities / Begleitung der Evaluationsaktivitäten / Accompagnement des activités d'évaluation 6. Reporting and diffusion of findings / Berichterstattung und Verbreitung der Resultate / Rapport et diffusion des résultats 7. Utilization follow up / «Follow up» – Nutzung der Resultate / «Follow up» de l'utilisation des résultats <p><i>Evaluation planning</i> (Evaluationsplanung / planification d'une évaluation) is understood to mean the process and product of preparatory actions to design an evaluation without its realization.</p> <p>The <i>terms of reference</i> (Pflichtenheft / cahier des charges (aussi termes de référence)) are a written document containing the responsibilities and tasks of the body carrying out the evaluation. They serve as a basis for a more detailed evaluation concept.</p> <p><i>Project organization</i> (Projektorganisation / organisation de projet): <i>Evaluation managers</i> (Evaluationsmanagerinnen und –manager / gestionnaires d'évaluation) are the evaluation professionals on the part of the evaluation commissioners. They significantly contribute to the quality and the actual benefit of evaluations and promote a good culture of evaluation within and outside of their organization. In the FOPH, evaluation managers operate as project leaders in the Evaluation and Research Service.</p> <p>A <i>steering group</i> (Steuerungsgruppe / groupe de pilotage) is a body with decision-making power, which consists of two or more persons representing the commissioners.</p> <p>An <i>advisory group</i> (or <i>monitoring group</i>) (Begleitgruppe / groupe d'accompagnement) is a body with an advisory support function, which consists of two or more persons; generally <i>stakeholders</i> (Beteiligte & Betroffene / partie prenantes et groupes concernés) of the evaluation.</p> <p><i>Valorization</i> (Valorisierung / valorisation) refers to the dissemination and utilization of an evaluation and its results.</p>

3. Alphabetical table of terms (index)

<i>English</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>Reference</i>
accompanying evaluation	Begleitende Evaluation	évaluation in itinere	Section 2, temporal location of an evaluation
accuracy	Genauigkeit	précision	Section 5, meta-evaluation
advisory group / monitoring group	Begleitgruppe	groupe d'accompagnement	Section 5, evaluation management
audit	Audit	audit	Section 1, audit
coherence	Kohärenz	cohérence	Section 4, coherence
context	Kontext	contexte	Section 3, context
cost-benefit ratio	Kosten-Nutzen-Relation	rapport coût-utilité / rapport coût-bénéfice	Section 4, economy
cost-effectiveness	Kosten-Wirksamkeit	coût-efficacité	Section 4, economy
cost-utility	Kosten-Nutzwert	coût-utilité	Section 4, economy
economy	Wirtschaftlichkeit	rentabilité / économie	Section 4, economy
effect	Wirkung = Effekt = Auswirkung	effet	Section 4, effect
effect model	Wirkungsmodell	modèle d'effets	Section 5, program picture
effectiveness / efficacy	Wirksamkeit = Effektivität	effectivité / efficacité	Section 4, effectiveness / efficacy
efficiency	Effizienz	efficience	Section 4, economy
evaluation	Evaluation	évaluation	Section 1, evaluation
evaluation management	Evaluationsmanagement	gestion de l'évaluation	Section 5, evaluation management
evaluation managers	Evaluationsmanagerinnen & -manager	gestionnaires d'évaluation	Section 5, evaluation management
evaluation planning	Evaluationsplanung	planification d'une évaluation	Section 5, evaluation management
execution location of an evaluation	Ort der Durchführung einer Evaluation	lieu de la réalisation d'une évaluation	Section 2, execution location of an evaluation
expedience / fit for purpose	Zweckmässigkeit	opportunité	Section 4, expedience / fit for purpose
external evaluation	Externe Evaluation	évaluation externe	Section 2, execution location of an evaluation
feasibility	Durchführbarkeit	faisabilité	Section 5, meta-evaluation
formative evaluation	Formative Evaluation	évaluation formative / évaluation endoformative	Section 2, (intended) use location of an evaluation
government research	Ressortforschung	recherche de l'administration	Section 1, government research
heteronomous evaluation	Fremdevaluation	évaluation hétéronome	Section 2, steering location of an evaluation
impact	Impact	impact	Section 3, impact
input	Input	input / moyens / intrants	Section 3, input

<i>English</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>French</i>	<i>Reference</i>
(intended) use location of an evaluation	Ort der (intendierten) Nutzung einer Evaluation	lieu de l'utilisation (envisagée) d'une évaluation	Section 2, (intended) use location of an evaluation
internal evaluation	Interne Evaluation	évaluation interne	Section 2, execution location of an evaluation
logic model	Logisches Modell	modèle logique	Section 5, program picture
meta-evaluation	Meta-Evaluation	méta-évaluation	Section 5, meta-evaluation
monitoring	Monitoring	monitorage / monitoring / suivi	Section 1, monitoring
outcome	Outcome	réalisation / effet direct	Section 3, outcome
output	Output	produits / extrants	Section 3, output
performance measurement	Leistungsmessung	mesure des performances	Section 1, performance measurement
process	Prozess	processus	Section 3, process
program picture	Programmbild	image du programme	Section 5, program picture
program theory	Programmtheorie	théorie du programme	Section 5, program picture
project organization	Projektorganisation	organisation de projet	Section 5, evaluation management
propriety	Korrektheit	déontologie	Section 5, meta-evaluation
prospective evaluation	Prospektive Evaluation	évaluation prospective	Section 2, temporal location of an evaluation
relevance	Relevanz	pertinence	Section 4, relevance
retrospective evaluation	Retrospektive Evaluation	évaluation rétrospective	Section 2, temporal location of an evaluation
self-evaluation	Selbstevaluation	auto-évaluation	Section 2, steering location of an evaluation
stakeholders	Beteiligte & Betroffene	parties prenantes et groupes concernés	Section 5, evaluation management
steering group	Steuerungsgruppe	groupe de pilotage	Section 5, evaluation management
steering location of an evaluation	Ort der Steuerung einer Evaluation	lieu du pilotage d'une évaluation	Section 2, steering location of an evaluation
summative evaluation	Summative Evaluation	évaluation sommative / évaluation récapitulative	Section 2, (intended) use location of an evaluation
sustainability	Nachhaltigkeit	durabilité / viabilité / pérennité	Section 4, sustainability
target group	Zielgruppe	groupe cible	Section 3, output
temporal location of an evaluation	Zeitliche Verortung einer Evaluation	temporalité de l'évaluation	Section 2, temporal location of an evaluation
terms of reference	Pflichtenheft	cahier des charges / termes de référence	Section 5, evaluation management
utility	Nützlichkeit	utilité	Section 5, meta-evaluation
valorization	Valorisierung	valorisation	Section 5, evaluation management

4. Further reading

- Balthasar, Andreas/Oetterli, Manuela (2014): Erarbeitung von Umsetzungsstrategien in sechs Schritten. Luzern/Bern: Interface/Bundesamt für Gesundheit.
- Balzer, Lars/Beywl, Wolfgang (2015): evaluiert. Planungsbuch für Evaluationen im Bildungsbereich. Bern: hep.
- Beywl, Wolfgang/Speer, Sandra (2004): Das A-B-C der wirkungsorientierten Evaluation. Glossar – Deutsch / Englisch der wirkungsorientierten Evaluation. Köln: Univation.
- Bundesamt für Gesundheit (BAG) (1997): Leitfaden für die Planung von Projekt- und Programmevaluation. Bern: BAG.
- Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) (1997): Guidelines for Health Programme & Project Evaluation Planning. Bern: FOPH.
 - Office fédéral de la santé publique (OFSP) (1997) : Guide pour la planification de l'évaluation de projets ou programmes de santé. Berne : OFSP.
- Bundesamt für Gesundheit (BAG) (2005): Glossar von Evaluationsbegriffen. Bern: BAG.
- Office fédéral de la santé publique (OFSP) (2005): Glossaire de termes d'évaluation. Berne : OFSP.
- Development Assistance Committee (DAC), OECD (2002): Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management – Glossaire des principaux termes relatifs à l'évaluation et la gestion axée sur les résultats – Glosario de los principales términos sobre evaluación y gestión en resultados. Paris : OECD.
- Interdepartementale Kontaktgruppe «Wirkungsprüfungen» (IDEKOWI) (2004): Wirksamkeit von Bundesmassnahmen. Vorschläge zur Umsetzung von Artikel 170 der Bundesverfassung bei Bundesrat und Bundesverwaltung. Bericht an die Generalsekretärenkonferenz der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Bern: Bundesamt für Justiz.
- Groupe de contact interdépartemental «Evaluation de l'efficacité» (IDEKOWI) (2004) : Efficacité des mesures prises par la Confédération. Propositions de mise en œuvre de l'art. 170 de la Constitution fédérale dans le contexte des activités du Conseil fédéral et de l'administration fédérale. Rapport à la Conférence des secrétaires généraux de la Confédération suisse. Berne : Office fédéral de la justice.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Hrsg.) (2006): Handbuch der Evaluationsstandards. 3. Auflage. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Sager, Fritz/Widmer, Thomas/Balthasar, Andreas (2017): Evaluation im politischen System der Schweiz. Zürich: NZZ.
- Schweizerische Evaluationsgesellschaft (SEVAL) (2016): Evaluationsstandards der Schweizerischen Evaluationsgesellschaft. Von der Mitgliederversammlung am 9. September 2016 verabschiedet. Bern: SEVAL.
- Société suisse d'évaluation (SEVAL) (2016) : Standards d'évaluation de la Société suisse d'évaluation. Adopté par l'assemblée générale au 9 septembre 2016. Berne : SEVAL.
- Scriven, Michael (1991): Evaluation Thesaurus. 4th ed. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Stockmann, Reinhard/Meyer, Wolfgang (2014): Evaluation. Eine Einführung. Opladen: Budrich.
- Weiss, Carol (1998) : Evaluation. Methods for Studying Programs and Policies. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Widmer, Thomas (2005): Leitfaden für Wirksamkeitsüberprüfungen beim Bund. Instrument zur Qualitätssicherung gestützt auf die Evaluationsstandards der Schweizerischen Evaluationsgesellschaft (SEVAL-Standards). Bern: Bundesamt für Justiz.
- _____ Guide de l'évaluation de l'efficacité à la Confédération. Instrument d'assurance qualité fondé sur les standards d'évaluation de la Société suisse d'évaluation (Standards SEVAL). Berne : Office fédéral de la justice.
- Widmer, Thomas/De Rocchi, Thomas (2012): Evaluation: Grundlagen, Ansätze und Anwendungen. Reihe Kompaktwissen, Band 16. Zürich: Rüegger.
- Widmer, Thomas/Frey, Kathrin (2008): Leitfaden zur Programmentwicklung beim Bundesamt für Gesundheit. Ein praxisorientiertes Instrument entwickelt im Rahmen der Studie «Erfolgsfaktoren der Programmentwicklung beim BAG». Bern: BAG.
- _____ Guide pour le développement de programmes à l'Office fédéral de la santé publique. Outil axé sur la pratique, élaboré dans le cadre de l'étude «Facteurs de réussite du développement de programmes à l'OFSP». Berne : OFSP.
- Widmer, Thomas/Landert, Charles/Bachmann, Nicole (2000): Evaluations-Standards der Schweizerischen Evaluationsgesellschaft (SEVAL-Standards). Bern/Genf: SEVAL.
- _____ Standards d'évaluation de la Société Suisse d'évaluation (SEVAL). Berne/Genève : SEVAL.
 - _____ Evaluation standards of SEVAL, the Swiss Evaluation Society (SEVAL-Standards). Bern/Geneva: SEVAL.

Further information and working tools for evaluation can be found on the website www.bag.admin.ch/evaluation.