

# PROGRAM EVALUATION MODELS METAEVALUATION CHECKLIST (Based on *The Program Evaluation Standards*)

Daniel L. Stufflebeam  
1999

*This checklist is for performing metaevaluations of program evaluation models. It is organized according to the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards. For each of the 30 standards the checklist includes 10 checkpoints drawn from the substance of the standard. It is suggested that each standard be scored on each checkpoint. Then judgments about the adequacy of the subject evaluation model in meeting the standard can be made as follows: 0-2 Poor, 3-4 Fair, 5-6 Good, 7-8 Very Good, 9-10 Excellent. It is recommended that an evaluation model be failed if it scores Poor on standards P1 Service Orientation, A5 Valid Information, A10 Justified Conclusions, or A11 Impartial Reporting. Users of this checklist are advised to consult the full text of *The Joint Committee (1994) Program Evaluation Standards*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.*

**To meet the requirements for Utility, evaluations using the \_\_\_\_\_ evaluation model should:**

## U1 Stakeholder Identification

- Clearly identify the evaluation client
- Engage leadership figures to identify other stakeholders
- Consult potential stakeholders to identify their information needs
- Use stakeholders to identify other stakeholders
- With the client, rank stakeholders for relative importance
- Arrange to involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation
- Keep the evaluation open to serve newly identified stakeholders
- Address stakeholders' evaluation needs
- Serve an appropriate range of individual stakeholders
- Serve an appropriate range of stakeholder organizations

9-10 Excellent   
  7-8 Very Good   
  5-6 Good   
  3-4 Fair   
  0-2 Poor

## U2 Evaluator Credibility

- Engage competent evaluators
- Engage evaluators whom the stakeholders trust
- Engage evaluators who can address stakeholders' concerns
- Engage evaluators who are appropriately responsive to issues of gender, socioeconomic status, race, and language and cultural differences
- Assure that the evaluation plan responds to key stakeholders' concerns
- Help stakeholders understand the evaluation plan
- Give stakeholders information on the evaluation plan's technical quality and practicality
- Attend appropriately to stakeholders' criticisms and suggestions
- Stay abreast of social and political forces
- Keep interested parties informed about the evaluation's progress

9-10 Excellent   
  7-8 Very Good   
  5-6 Good   
  3-4 Fair   
  0-2 Poor

## U3 Information Scope and Selection

- Understand the client's most important evaluation requirements
- Interview stakeholders to determine their different perspectives
- Assure that evaluator and client negotiate pertinent audiences, questions, and required information
- Assign priority to the most important stakeholders



<input type="checkbox"/> Assign priority to the most important questions <input type="checkbox"/> Allow flexibility for adding questions during the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain sufficient information to address the stakeholders' most important evaluation questions <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain sufficient information to assess the program's merit <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain sufficient information to assess the program's worth <input type="checkbox"/> Allocate the evaluation effort in accordance with the priorities assigned to the needed information
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>U4 Values Identification</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider alternative sources of values for interpreting evaluation findings <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a clear, defensible basis for value judgments <input type="checkbox"/> Determine the appropriate party(s) to make the valuational interpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Identify pertinent societal needs <input type="checkbox"/> Identify pertinent customer needs <input type="checkbox"/> Reference pertinent laws <input type="checkbox"/> Reference, as appropriate, the relevant institutional mission <input type="checkbox"/> Reference the program's goals <input type="checkbox"/> Take into account the stakeholders' values <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, present alternative interpretations based on conflicting but credible value bases
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>U5 Report Clarity</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly report the essential information <input type="checkbox"/> Issue brief, simple, and direct reports <input type="checkbox"/> Focus reports on contracted questions <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the program and its context <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the evaluation's purposes, procedures, and findings <input type="checkbox"/> Support conclusions and recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Avoid reporting technical jargon <input type="checkbox"/> Report in the language(s) of stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Provide an executive summary <input type="checkbox"/> Provide a technical report
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Make timely interim reports to intended users <input type="checkbox"/> Deliver the final report when it is needed <input type="checkbox"/> Have timely exchanges with the program's policy board <input type="checkbox"/> Have timely exchanges with the program's staff <input type="checkbox"/> Have timely exchanges with the program's customers <input type="checkbox"/> Have timely exchanges with the public media <input type="checkbox"/> Have timely exchanges with the full range of right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Employ effective media for reaching and informing the different audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Keep the presentations appropriately brief <input type="checkbox"/> Use examples to help audiences relate the findings to practical situations
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor

<b>U7 Evaluation Impact</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Maintain contact with audience <input type="checkbox"/> Involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage and support stakeholders' use of the findings <input type="checkbox"/> Show stakeholders how they might use the findings in their work <input type="checkbox"/> Forecast and address potential uses of findings <input type="checkbox"/> Provide interim reports <input type="checkbox"/> Make sure that reports are open, frank, and concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement written reports with ongoing oral communication <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct feedback workshops to go over and apply findings <input type="checkbox"/> Make arrangements to provide follow-up assistance in interpreting and applying the findings	
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor	
<b>Scoring the Evaluation for UTILITY</b> <b>Add the following:</b> Number of Excellent ratings (0-7)    _____ x 4 = _____ Number of Very Good (0-7)            _____ x 3 = _____ Number of Good (0-7)                    _____ x 2 = _____ Number of Fair (0-7)                     _____ x 1 = _____  <div style="text-align: right;">Total score:                                    = _____</div>	<b>Strength of the model's provisions for UTILITY:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 26 (93%) to 28: <b>Excellent</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 19 (68%) to 25: <b>Very Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 14 (50%) to 18: <b>Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 7 (25%) to 13: <b>Fair</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 5: <b>Poor</b>  _____ (Total score) ÷ 28 = _____ x 100 = _____
<b><i>To meet the requirements for feasibility, evaluations using the _____ evaluation model <u>should</u>:</i></b>	
<b>F1 Practical Procedures</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Tailor methods and instruments to information requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Minimize disruption <input type="checkbox"/> Minimize the data burden <input type="checkbox"/> Appoint competent staff <input type="checkbox"/> Train staff <input type="checkbox"/> Choose procedures that the staff are qualified to carry out <input type="checkbox"/> Choose procedures in light of known constraints <input type="checkbox"/> Make a realistic schedule <input type="checkbox"/> Engage locals to help conduct the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, make evaluation procedures a part of routine events	
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor	
<b>F2 Political Viability</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Anticipate different positions of different interest groups <input type="checkbox"/> Avert or counteract attempts to bias or misapply the findings <input type="checkbox"/> Foster cooperation <input type="checkbox"/> Involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Agree on editorial and dissemination authority <input type="checkbox"/> Issue interim reports <input type="checkbox"/> Report divergent views <input type="checkbox"/> Report to right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Employ a firm public contract	

Terminate any corrupted evaluation

9-10 Excellent     7-8 Very Good     5-6 Good     3-4 Fair     0-2 Poor

**F3 Cost Effectiveness**

Be efficient

Make use of in-kind services

Produce information worth the investment

Inform decisions

Foster program improvement

Provide accountability information

Generate new insights

Help spread effective practices

Minimize disruptions

Minimize time demands on program personnel

9-10 Excellent     7-8 Very Good     5-6 Good     3-4 Fair     0-2 Poor

<p><b>Scoring the Evaluation for FEASIBILITY</b> Add the following:</p> <p>Number of Excellent ratings 0-3      _____ x 4 = _____</p> <p>Number of Very Good (0-3)            _____ x 3 = _____</p> <p>Number of Good (0-3)                    _____ x 2 = _____</p> <p>Number of Fair (0-3)                      _____ x 1 = _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total score:                                    = _____</p>	<p><b>Strength of the model's provisions for FEASIBILITY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 11 (93%) to 12:            <b>Excellent</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 8 (68%) to 10:             <b>Very Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6 (50%) to 7:                <b>Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 (25%) to 5:                <b>Fair</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 2:                 <b>Poor</b></p> <p>_____ (Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ x 100 = _____</p>
---	---

**To meet the requirements for Propriety, evaluations using the \_\_\_\_\_ evaluation model should:**

**P1 Service Orientation**

Assess needs of the program's customers

Assess program outcomes against targeted customers' assessed needs

Help assure that the full range of rightful program beneficiaries are served

Promote excellent service

Make the evaluation's service orientation clear to stakeholders

Identify program strengths to build on

Identify program weaknesses to correct

Give interim feedback for program improvement

Expose harmful practices

Inform all right-to-know audiences of the program's positive and negative outcomes

9-10 Excellent     7-8 Very Good     5-6 Good     3-4 Fair     0-2 Poor

**P2 Formal Agreements, reach advance written agreements on:**

Evaluation purpose and questions

Audiences

Evaluation reports

Editing

Release of reports

Evaluation procedures and schedule

<input type="checkbox"/> Confidentiality/anonymity of data <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation staff <input type="checkbox"/> Metaevaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation resources
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>P3 Rights of Human Subjects</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Make clear to stakeholders that the evaluation will respect and protect the rights of human subjects <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify intended uses of the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Keep stakeholders informed <input type="checkbox"/> Follow due process <input type="checkbox"/> Uphold civil rights <input type="checkbox"/> Understand participant values <input type="checkbox"/> Respect diversity <input type="checkbox"/> Follow protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Honor confidentiality/anonymity agreements <input type="checkbox"/> Do no harm
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>P4 Human Interactions</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently relate to all stakeholders in a professional manner <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain effective communication with stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Follow the institution's protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Minimize disruption <input type="checkbox"/> Honor participants' privacy rights <input type="checkbox"/> Honor time commitments <input type="checkbox"/> Be alert to and address participants' concerns about the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Be sensitive to participants' diversity of values and cultural differences <input type="checkbox"/> Be even-handed in addressing different stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Do not ignore or help cover up any participant's incompetence, unethical behavior, fraud, waste, or abuse
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>P5 Complete and Fair Assessment</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Assess and report the program's strengths <input type="checkbox"/> Assess and report the program's weaknesses <input type="checkbox"/> Report on intended outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Report on unintended outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Give a thorough account of the evaluation's process <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, show how the program's strengths could be used to overcome its weaknesses <input type="checkbox"/> Have the draft report reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately address criticisms of the draft report <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge the final report's limitations <input type="checkbox"/> Estimate and report the effects of the evaluation's limitations on the overall judgment of the program
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor

<b>P6 Disclosure of Findings</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Define the right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Establish a contractual basis for complying with right-to-know requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Inform the audiences of the evaluation's purposes and projected reports <input type="checkbox"/> Report all findings in writing <input type="checkbox"/> Report relevant points of view of both supporters and critics of the program <input type="checkbox"/> Report balanced, informed conclusions and recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Show the basis for the conclusions and recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Disclose the evaluation's limitations <input type="checkbox"/> In reporting, adhere strictly to a code of directness, openness, and completeness <input type="checkbox"/> Assure that reports reach their audiences				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good
<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2	Poor	
<b>P7 Conflict of Interest</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify potential conflicts of interest early in the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Provide written, contractual safeguards against identified conflicts of interest <input type="checkbox"/> Engage multiple evaluators <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain evaluation records for independent review <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, engage independent parties to assess the evaluation for its susceptibility or corruption by conflicts of interest <input type="checkbox"/> When appropriate, release evaluation procedures, data, and reports for public review <input type="checkbox"/> Contract with the funding authority rather than the funded program <input type="checkbox"/> Have internal evaluators report directly to the chief executive officer <input type="checkbox"/> Report equitably to all right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Engage uniquely qualified persons to participate in the evaluation, even if they have a potential conflict of interest; but take steps to counteract the conflict				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good
<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2	Poor	
<b>P8 Fiscal Responsibility</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Specify and budget for expense items in advance <input type="checkbox"/> Keep the budget sufficiently flexible to permit appropriate reallocations to strengthen the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain appropriate approval for needed budgetary modifications <input type="checkbox"/> Assign responsibility for managing the evaluation finances <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain accurate records of sources of funding and expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain adequate personnel records concerning job allocations and time spent on the job <input type="checkbox"/> Employ comparison shopping for evaluation materials <input type="checkbox"/> Employ comparison contract bidding <input type="checkbox"/> Be frugal in expending evaluation resources <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, include an expenditure summary as part of the public evaluation report				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good
<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2	Poor	

<p><b>Scoring the Evaluation for PROPRIETY</b></p> <p><b>Add the following:</b></p> <p>Number of Excellent ratings (0-8)      _____ x 4 = _____</p> <p>Number of Very Good (0-8)            _____ x 3 = _____</p> <p>Number of Good (0-8)                    _____ x 2 = _____</p> <p>Number of Fair (0-8)                    _____ x 1 = _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total score:                                    = _____</p>	<p><b>Strength of the model's provisions for PROPRIETY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 30 (93%) to 32:      <b>Excellent</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 22 (68%) to 29:      <b>Very Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 16 (50%) to 21:      <b>Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 8 (25%) to 15:        <b>Fair</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 7:            <b>Poor</b></p> <p>_____ (Total score) ÷ 32 = _____ x 100 = _____</p>
---	---

***To meet the requirements for accuracy, evaluations using the \_\_\_\_\_ evaluation model should:***

**A1 Program Documentation**

- Collect descriptions of the intended program from various written sources
- Collect descriptions of the intended program from the client and various stakeholders
- Describe how the program was intended to function
- Maintain records from various sources of how the program operated
- As feasible, engage independent observers to describe the program's actual operations
- Describe how the program actually functioned
- Analyze discrepancies between the various descriptions of how the program was intended to function
- Analyze discrepancies between how the program was intended to operate and how it actually operated
- Ask the client and various stakeholders to assess the accuracy of recorded descriptions of both the intended and the actual program
- Produce a technical report that documents the program's operations

9-10 Excellent       7-8 Very Good       5-6 Good       3-4 Fair       0-2 Poor

**A2 Context Analysis**

- Use multiple sources of information to describe the program's context
- Describe the context's technical, social, political, organizational, and economic features
- Maintain a log of unusual circumstances
- Record instances in which individuals or groups intentionally or otherwise interfered with the program
- Record instances in which individuals or groups intentionally or otherwise gave special assistance to the program
- Analyze how the program's context is similar to or different from contexts where the program might be adopted
- Report those contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the program and that might be of interest to potential adopters
- Estimate effects of context on program outcomes
- Identify and describe any critical competitors to this program that functioned at the same time and in the program's environment
- Describe how people in the program's general area perceived the program's existence, importance, and quality

9-10 Excellent       7-8 Very Good       5-6 Good       3-4 Fair       0-2 Poor

**A3 Described Purposes and Procedures**

- At the evaluation's outset, record the client's purposes for the evaluation
- Monitor and describe stakeholders' intended uses of evaluation findings
- Monitor and describe how the evaluation's purposes stay the same or change over time

- Identify and assess points of agreement and disagreement among stakeholders regarding the evaluation's purposes
- As appropriate, update evaluation procedures to accommodate changes in the evaluation's purposes
- Record the actual evaluation procedures, as implemented
- When interpreting findings, take into account the different stakeholders' intended uses of the evaluation
- When interpreting findings, take into account the extent to which the intended procedures were effectively executed
- Describe the evaluation's purposes and procedures in the summary and full-length evaluation reports
- As feasible, engage independent evaluators to monitor and evaluate the evaluation's purposes and procedures

9-10 Excellent       7-8 Very Good       5-6 Good       3-4 Fair       0-2 Poor

**A4 Defensible Information Sources**

- Obtain information from a variety of sources
- Use pertinent, previously collected information once validated
- As appropriate, employ a variety of data collection methods
- Document and report information sources
- Document, justify, and report the criteria and methods used to select information sources
- For each source, define the population
- For each population, as appropriate, define any employed sample
- Document, justify, and report the means used to obtain information from each source
- Include data collection instruments in a technical appendix to the evaluation report
- Document and report any biasing features in the obtained information

9-10 Excellent       7-8 Very Good       5-6 Good       3-4 Fair       0-2 Poor

**A5 Valid Information**

- Focus the evaluation on key questions
- As appropriate, employ multiple measures to address each question
- Provide a detailed description of the constructs and behaviors about which information will be acquired
- Assess and report what type of information each employed procedure acquires
- Train and calibrate the data collectors
- Document and report the data collection conditions and process
- Document how information from each procedure was scored, analyzed, and interpreted
- Report and justify inferences singly and in combination
- Assess and report the comprehensiveness of the information provided by the procedures as a set in relation to the information needed to answer the set of evaluation questions
- Establish meaningful categories of information by identifying regular and recurrent themes in information collected using qualitative assessment procedures

9-10 Excellent       7-8 Very Good       5-6 Good       3-4 Fair       0-2 Poor

**A6 Reliable Information**

- Identify and justify the type(s) and extent of reliability claimed
- For each employed data collection device, specify the unit of analysis
- As feasible, choose measuring devices that in the past have shown acceptable levels of reliability for their intended uses
- In reporting reliability of an instrument, assess and report the factors that influenced the reliability, including the characteristics of the examinees, the data collection conditions, and the evaluator's biases
- Check and report the consistency of scoring, categorization, and coding
- Train and calibrate scorers and analysts to produce consistent results



<input type="checkbox"/> Pilot test new instruments in order to identify and control sources of error <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate, engage and check the consistency between multiple observers <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge reliability problems in the final report <input type="checkbox"/> Estimate and report the effects of unreliability in the data on the overall judgment of the program
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>A7 Systematic Information</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Establish protocols for quality control of the evaluation information <input type="checkbox"/> Train the evaluation staff to adhere to the data protocols <input type="checkbox"/> Systematically check the accuracy of scoring and coding <input type="checkbox"/> When feasible, use multiple evaluators and check the consistency of their work <input type="checkbox"/> Verify data entry <input type="checkbox"/> Proofread and verify data tables generated from computer output or other means <input type="checkbox"/> Systematize and control storage of the evaluation information <input type="checkbox"/> Define who will have access to the evaluation information <input type="checkbox"/> Strictly control access to the evaluation information according to established protocols <input type="checkbox"/> Have data providers verify the data they submitted
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Begin by conducting preliminary exploratory analyses to assure the data's correctness and to gain a greater understanding of the data <input type="checkbox"/> Choose procedures appropriate for the evaluation questions and nature of the data <input type="checkbox"/> For each procedure specify how its key assumptions are being met <input type="checkbox"/> Report limitations of each analytic procedure, including failure to meet assumptions <input type="checkbox"/> Employ multiple analytic procedures to check on consistency and replicability of findings <input type="checkbox"/> Examine variability as well as central tendencies <input type="checkbox"/> Identify and examine outliers and verify their correctness <input type="checkbox"/> Identify and analyze statistical interactions <input type="checkbox"/> Assess statistical significance and practical significance <input type="checkbox"/> Use visual displays to clarify the presentation and interpretation of statistical results
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor
<b>A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on key questions <input type="checkbox"/> Define the boundaries of information to be used <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain information keyed to the important evaluation questions <input type="checkbox"/> Verify the accuracy of findings by obtaining confirmatory evidence from multiple sources, including stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Choose analytic procedures and methods of summarization that are appropriate to the evaluation questions and employed qualitative information <input type="checkbox"/> Derive a set of categories that is sufficient to document, illuminate, and respond to the evaluation questions <input type="checkbox"/> Test the derived categories for reliability and validity <input type="checkbox"/> Classify the obtained information into the validated analysis categories <input type="checkbox"/> Derive conclusions and recommendations and demonstrate their meaningfulness <input type="checkbox"/> Report limitations of the referenced information, analyses, and inferences
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 Poor

<b>A10 Justified Conclusions</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Focus conclusions directly on the evaluation questions <input type="checkbox"/> Accurately reflect the evaluation procedures and findings <input type="checkbox"/> Limit conclusions to the applicable time periods, contexts, purposes, and activities <input type="checkbox"/> Cite the information that supports each conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Identify and report the program's side effects <input type="checkbox"/> Report plausible alternative explanations of the findings <input type="checkbox"/> Explain why rival explanations were rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Warn against making common misinterpretations <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain and address the results of a prerelease review of the draft evaluation report <input type="checkbox"/> Report the evaluation's limitations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>A11 Impartial Reporting</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Engage the client to determine steps to ensure fair, impartial reports <input type="checkbox"/> Establish appropriate editorial authority <input type="checkbox"/> Determine right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Establish and follow appropriate plans for releasing findings to all right-to-know audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Safeguard reports from deliberate or inadvertent distortions <input type="checkbox"/> Report perspectives of all stakeholder groups <input type="checkbox"/> Report alternative plausible conclusions <input type="checkbox"/> Obtain outside audits of reports <input type="checkbox"/> Describe steps taken to control bias <input type="checkbox"/> Participate in public presentations of the findings to help guard against and correct distortions by other interested parties				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>A12 Metaevaluation</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Designate or define the standards to be used in judging the evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Assign someone responsibility for documenting and assessing the evaluation process and products <input type="checkbox"/> Employ both formative and summative metaevaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Budget appropriately and sufficiently for conducting the metaevaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Record the full range of information needed to judge the evaluation against the stipulated standards <input type="checkbox"/> As feasible, contract for an independent metaevaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Determine and record which audiences will receive the metaevaluation report <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the instrumentation, data collection, data handling, coding, and analysis against the relevant standards <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the evaluation's involvement of and communication of findings to stakeholders against the relevant standards <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain a record of all metaevaluation steps, information, and analyses				
<input type="checkbox"/> 9-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 7-8	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-6	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-4	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-2
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor

Scoring the Evaluation for ACCURACY		Strength of the model's provisions for ACCURACY	
Add the following:			
Number of Excellent ratings (0-12)	_____ x 4 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 45 (93%) to 48:	<b>Excellent</b>
Number of Very Good (0-12)	_____ x 3 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 33 (68%) to 44:	<b>Very Good</b>
Number of Good (0-12)	_____ x 2 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 24 (50%) to 32:	<b>Good</b>
Number of Fair (0-12)	_____ x 1 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 12 (25%) to 23:	<b>Fair</b>
	Total score: _____ = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 11:	<b>Poor</b>
		_____ (Total score) ÷ 48 = _____ x 100 = _____	

*This checklist is being provided as a free service to the user. The provider of the checklist has not modified or adapted the checklist to fit the specific needs of the user and the user is executing his or her own discretion and judgment in using the checklist. The provider of the checklist makes no representations or warranties that this checklist is fit for the particular purpose contemplated by user and specifically disclaims any such warranties or representations.*