PROGRAM EVALUATIONS METAEVALUATION CHECKLIST
(Based on *The Program Evaluation Standards*)

Daniel L. Stufflebeam
1999

This checklist is for performing final, summative metaevaluations. 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 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 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) <u>Program Evaluation Standards</u>*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.*

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR UTILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS <u>SHOULD</u>:

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
- ☐ Assign priority to the most important questions
- ☐ Allow flexibility for adding questions during the evaluation
- ☐ Obtain sufficient information to address the stakeholders' most important evaluation questions
- ☐ Obtain sufficient information to assess the program's merit
- ☐ Obtain sufficient information to assess the program's worth
- ☐ Allocate the evaluation effort in accordance with the priorities assigned to the needed information

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

U4 Values Identification

- ☐ Consider alternative sources of values for interpreting evaluation findings
- ☐ Provide a clear, defensible basis for value judgments
- ☐ Determine the appropriate party(s) to make the valuational interpretations
- ☐ Identify pertinent societal needs
- ☐ Identify pertinent customer needs
- ☐ Reference pertinent laws
- ☐ Reference, as appropriate, the relevant institutional mission
- ☐ Reference the program's goals
- ☐ Take into account the stakeholders' values
- ☐ As appropriate, present alternative interpretations based on conflicting but credible value bases

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

U5 Report Clarity

- ☐ Clearly report the essential information
- ☐ Issue brief, simple, and direct reports
- ☐ Focus reports on contracted questions
- ☐ Describe the program and its context
- ☐ Describe the evaluation's purposes, procedures, and findings
- ☐ Support conclusions and recommendations
- ☐ Avoid reporting technical jargon
- ☐ Report in the language(s) of stakeholders
- ☐ Provide an executive summary
- ☐ Provide a technical report

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

U6 Report Timeliness and Dissemination

- ☐ Make timely interim reports to intended users
- ☐ Deliver the final report when it is needed
- ☐ Have timely exchanges with the program's policy board
- ☐ Have timely exchanges with the program's staff
- ☐ Have timely exchanges with the program's customers
- ☐ Have timely exchanges with the public media

☐ Have timely exchanges with the full range of right-to-know audiences				
☐ Employ effective media for reaching and informing the different audiences				
☐ Keep the presentations appropriately brief				
☐ Use examples to help audiences relate the findings to practical situations				
☐ 9-10 Excellent	☐ 7-8 Very Good	☐ 5-6 Good	☐ 3-4 Fair	☐ 0-2 Poor

U7 Evaluation Impact

☐ Maintain contact with audience
☐ Involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation
☐ Encourage and support stakeholders' use of the findings
☐ Show stakeholders how they might use the findings in their work
☐ Forecast and address potential uses of findings
☐ Provide interim reports
☐ Make sure that reports are open, frank, and concrete
☐ Supplement written reports with ongoing oral communication
☐ Conduct feedback workshops to go over and apply findings
☐ Make arrangements to provide follow-up assistance in interpreting and applying the findings

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

Scoring the Evaluation for UTILITY **Add the following:**	**Strength of the evaluation's provisions for UTILITY:**
Number of Excellent ratings (0-7) _____ x 4 = _____	☐ 26 (93%) to 28: **Excellent**
Number of Very Good (0-7) _____ x 3 = _____	☐ 19 (68%) to 25: **Very Good**
Number of Good (0-7) _____ x 2 = _____	☐ 14 (50%) to 18: **Good**
Number of Fair (0-7) _____ x 1 = _____	☐ 7 (25%) to 13: **Fair**
Total score: = _____	☐ 0 (0%) to 5: **Poor**
	_____ **(Total score) ÷28 = _____ x 100 = _____**

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FEASIBILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:

F1 Practical Procedures

☐ Tailor methods and instruments to information requirements
☐ Minimize disruption
☐ Minimize the data burden
☐ Appoint competent staff
☐ Train staff
☐ Choose procedures that the staff are qualified to carry out
☐ Choose procedures in light of known constraints
☐ Make a realistic schedule
☐ Engage locals to help conduct the evaluation
☐ As appropriate, make evaluation procedures a part of routine events

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

F2 Political Viability
☐   Anticipate different positions of different interest groups
☐   Avert or counteract attempts to bias or misapply the findings
☐   Foster cooperation
☐   Involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation
☐   Agree on editorial and dissemination authority
☐   Issue interim reports
☐   Report divergent views
☐   Report to right-to-know audiences
☐   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

Scoring the Evaluation for FEASIBILITY
Add the following:

Number of Excellent ratings 0-3) _____ x 4 = _____

Number of Very Good (0-3) _____ x 3 = _____

Number of Good (0-3) _____ x 2 = _____

Number of Fair (0-3 _____ x 1 = _____

Total score: = _____

Strength of the evaluation's provisions for FEASIBILITY

☐ 11 (93%) to 12:   **Excellent**

☐ 8 (68%) to 10:   **Very Good**

☐ 6 (50%) to 7:   **Good**

☐ 3 (25%) to 5:   **Fair**

☐ 0 (0%) to 2:   **Poor**

_____ **(Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ x 100 =**

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPRIETY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS 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
☐	Confidentiality/anonymity of data
☐	Evaluation staff
☐	Metaevaluation
☐	Evaluation resources

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

P3 Rights of Human Subjects

☐	Make clear to stakeholders that the evaluation will respect and protect the rights of human subjects
☐	Clarify intended uses of the evaluation
☐	Keep stakeholders informed
☐	Follow due process
☐	Uphold civil rights
☐	Understand participant values
☐	Respect diversity
☐	Follow protocol
☐	Honor confidentiality/anonymity agreements
☐	Do no harm

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

P4 Human Interactions

☐	Consistently relate to all stakeholders in a professional manner
☐	Maintain effective communication with stakeholders
☐	Follow the institution's protocol
☐	Minimize disruption
☐	Honor participants' privacy rights
☐	Honor time commitments
☐	Be alert to and address participants' concerns about the evaluation
☐	Be sensitive to participants' diversity of values and cultural differences
☐	Be even-handed in addressing different stakeholders
☐	Do not ignore or help cover up any participant's incompetence, unethical behavior, fraud, waste, or abuse

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

P5 Complete and Fair Assessment				
☐ Assess and report the program's strengths				
☐ Assess and report the program's weaknesses				
☐ Report on intended outcomes				
☐ Report on unintended outcomes				
☐ Give a thorough account of the evaluation's process				
☐ As appropriate, show how the program's strengths could be used to overcome its weaknesses				
☐ Have the draft report reviewed				
☐ Appropriately address criticisms of the draft report				
☐ Acknowledge the final report's limitations				
☐ Estimate and report the effects of the evaluation's limitations on the overall judgment of the program				
☐ 9-10 Excellent	☐ 7-8 Very Good	☐ 5-6 Good	☐ 3-4 Fair	☐ 0-2 Poor

P6 Disclosure of Findings				
☐ Define the right-to-know audiences				
☐ Establish a contractual basis for complying with right-to-know requirements				
☐ Inform the audiences of the evaluation's purposes and projected reports				
☐ Report all findings in writing				
☐ Report relevant points of view of both supporters and critics of the program				
☐ Report balanced, informed conclusions and recommendations				
☐ Show the basis for the conclusions and recommendations				
☐ Disclose the evaluation's limitations				
☐ In reporting, adhere strictly to a code of directness, openness, and completeness				
☐ Assure that reports reach their audiences				
☐ 9-10 Excellent	☐ 7-8 Very Good	☐ 5-6 Good	☐ 3-4 Fair	☐ 0-2 Poor

P7 Conflict of Interest				
☐ Identify potential conflicts of interest early in the evaluation				
☐ Provide written, contractual safeguards against identified conflicts of interest				
☐ Engage multiple evaluators				
☐ Maintain evaluation records for independent review				
☐ As appropriate, engage independent parties to assess the evaluation for its susceptibility or corruption by conflicts of interest				
☐ When appropriate, release evaluation procedures, data, and reports for public review				
☐ Contract with the funding authority rather than the funded program				
☐ Have internal evaluators report directly to the chief executive officer				
☐ Report equitably to all right-to-know audiences				
☐ 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				
☐ 9-10 Excellent	☐ 7-8 Very Good	☐ 5-6 Good	☐ 3-4 Fair	☐ 0-2 Poor

P8 Fiscal Responsibility

☐   Specify and budget for expense items in advance
☐   Keep the budget sufficiently flexible to permit appropriate reallocations to strengthen the evaluation
☐   Obtain appropriate approval for needed budgetary modifications
☐   Assign responsibility for managing the evaluation finances
☐   Maintain accurate records of sources of funding and expenditures
☐   Maintain adequate personnel records concerning job allocations and time spent on the job
☐   Employ comparison shopping for evaluation materials
☐   Employ comparison contract bidding
☐   Be frugal in expending evaluation resources
☐   As appropriate, include an expenditure summary as part of the public evaluation report

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

Scoring the Evaluation for PROPRIETY **Add the following:**	**Strength of the evaluation's provisions for PROPRIETY**
Number of Excellent ratings (0-8) _____ x 4 = _____	☐ 30 (93%) to 32: **Excellent**
Number of Very Good (0-8) _____ x 3 = _____	☐ 22 (68%) to 29: **Very Good**
Number of Good (0-8) _____ x 2 = _____	☐ 16 (50%) to 21: **Good**
Number of Fair (0-8) _____ x 1 = _____	☐ 8 (25%) to 15: **Fair**
Total score: _____ = _____	☐ 0 (0%) to 7: **Poor**
	_____ (Total score) ÷ 32 = ____ x 100 = ____

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCURACY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS <u>SHOULD</u>:

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
- ☐ Pilot test new instruments in order to identify and control sources of error
- ☐ As appropriate, engage and check the consistency between multiple observers
- ☐ Acknowledge reliability problems in the final report
- ☐ Estimate and report the effects of unreliability in the data on the overall judgment of the program

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

A7 Systematic Information

- ☐ Establish protocols for quality control of the evaluation information
- ☐ Train the evaluation staff to adhere to the data protocols
- ☐ Systematically check the accuracy of scoring and coding
- ☐ When feasible, use multiple evaluators and check the consistency of their work
- ☐ Verify data entry
- ☐ Proofread and verify data tables generated from computer output or other means
- ☐ Systematize and control storage of the evaluation information
- ☐ Define who will have access to the evaluation information
- ☐ Strictly control access to the evaluation information according to established protocols
- ☐ Have data providers verify the data they submitted

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

A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information

- ☐ Begin by conducting preliminary exploratory analyses to assure the data's correctness and to gain a greater understanding of the data
- ☐ Choose procedures appropriate for the evaluation questions and nature of the data
- ☐ For each procedure specify how its key assumptions are being met
- ☐ Report limitations of each analytic procedure, including failure to meet assumptions
- ☐ Employ multiple analytic procedures to check on consistency and replicability of findings
- ☐ Examine variability as well as central tendencies
- ☐ Identify and examine outliers and verify their correctness
- ☐ Identify and analyze statistical interactions
- ☐ Assess statistical significance and practical significance
- ☐ Use visual displays to clarify the presentation and interpretation of statistical results

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

A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information

- ☐ Focus on key questions
- ☐ Define the boundaries of information to be used
- ☐ Obtain information keyed to the important evaluation questions
- ☐ Verify the accuracy of findings by obtaining confirmatory evidence from multiple sources, including stakeholders
- ☐ Choose analytic procedures and methods of summarization that are appropriate to the evaluation questions and employed qualitative information
- ☐ Derive a set of categories that is sufficient to document, illuminate, and respond to the evaluation questions
- ☐ Test the derived categories for reliability and validity
- ☐ Classify the obtained information into the validated analysis categories
- ☐ Derive conclusions and recommendations and demonstrate their meaningfulness
- ☐ Report limitations of the referenced information, analyses, and inferences

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

A10 Justified Conclusions

- ☐ Focus conclusions directly on the evaluation questions
- ☐ Accurately reflect the evaluation procedures and findings
- ☐ Limit conclusions to the applicable time periods, contexts, purposes, and activities
- ☐ Cite the information that supports each conclusion
- ☐ Identify and report the program's side effects
- ☐ Report plausible alternative explanations of the findings
- ☐ Explain why rival explanations were rejected
- ☐ Warn against making common misinterpretations
- ☐ Obtain and address the results of a prerelease review of the draft evaluation report
- ☐ Report the evaluation's limitations

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

A11 Impartial Reporting

- ☐ Engage the client to determine steps to ensure fair, impartial reports
- ☐ Establish appropriate editorial authority
- ☐ Determine right-to-know audiences
- ☐ Establish and follow appropriate plans for releasing findings to all right-to-know audiences
- ☐ Safeguard reports from deliberate or inadvertent distortions
- ☐ Report perspectives of all stakeholder groups
- ☐ Report alternative plausible conclusions
- ☐ Obtain outside audits of reports
- ☐ Describe steps taken to control bias
- ☐ Participate in public presentations of the findings to help guard against and correct distortions by other interested parties

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

A12 Metaevaluation

☐   Designate or define the standards to be used in judging the evaluation

☐   Assign someone responsibility for documenting and assessing the evaluation process and products

☐   Employ both formative and summative metaevaluation

☐   Budget appropriately and sufficiently for conducting the metaevaluation

☐   Record the full range of information needed to judge the evaluation against the stipulated standards

☐   As feasible, contract for an independent metaevaluation

☐   Determine and record which audiences will receive the metaevaluation report

☐   Evaluate the instrumentation, data collection, data handling, coding, and analysis against the relevant standards

☐   Evaluate the evaluation's involvement of and communication of findings to stakeholders against the relevant standards

☐   Maintain a record of all metaevaluation steps, information, and analyses

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

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