Metaevaluation Criteria and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaevaluation Criteria</th>
<th>GAGAS</th>
<th>PES</th>
<th>KEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Objectives</td>
<td>Report Contents (8.07)</td>
<td>Preface (Preliminaries II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Identified</td>
<td>Values Identification (U4)</td>
<td>Values (Foundations 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Quality Control and Assurance (3.49)</td>
<td>Methodology (Preliminaries III)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Compliance</td>
<td>Statement on GAGAS Compliance (8.30)</td>
<td>Metaevaluation (Conclusions and Implications 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Identification</td>
<td>Stakeholder Ident. (U1)</td>
<td>Preface (Preliminaries II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete (8.41)</td>
<td>Information Scope &amp; Selection (U3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Accurate (8.43)</td>
<td>Accuracy (A1, A4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensible</td>
<td>Evidence (7.48)</td>
<td>Accuracy (A10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects Rights</td>
<td>Rights of Human Sub. (P3)</td>
<td>Metaevaluation (Conclusions and Implications 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>Evidence (7.50)</td>
<td>Comparisons (Subevaluations 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Analysis</td>
<td>Findings (8.13)</td>
<td>Context Analysis (A2)</td>
<td>Preface (Preliminaries II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Clear (8.50)</td>
<td>Report Clarity (U5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise</td>
<td>Concise (8.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings and Conclusions</td>
<td>Findings (8.13)</td>
<td>Conclusions (8.27)</td>
<td>Synthesis (Conclusions and Implications 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions (8.27)</td>
<td>Convincing (8.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Recommendations (8.28)</td>
<td>Recommendations and Explanations (Conclusions and Implications 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Timely (8.39)</td>
<td>Report Timeliness and Dissemination (U6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
<th>Fails to Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Scope and Objectives</td>
<td>The report lists the <em>specific</em> agency/department and/or activities to be evaluated/audited. The report lists the objectives of the audit/evaluation and how the objectives were determined (by legislative direction, statute, etc.).</td>
<td>The report specifies either the agency/department/activity evaluated or the objectives but not both.</td>
<td>The report fails to specify both the agency/department/activities evaluated/audited and the objectives and their source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Values</td>
<td>The report clearly identifies the values used to determine the evaluative conclusions.</td>
<td>The report implies the values used without clearly identifying them.</td>
<td>The report fails to address the values used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>The report clearly identifies sufficient internal quality control measures and any external peer reviews conducted of its organization.</td>
<td>The report identifies limited internal quality control measures and no external organizational reviews.</td>
<td>The report identifies no internal quality control measures and no external organizational reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Standards Compliance</td>
<td>The report states what standards (PES, GAGAS), if any, guides its conduct.</td>
<td>The report refers to adherence to general professional standards but does not specify which standards.</td>
<td>The report does not address standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Identification</td>
<td>The report clearly identifies stakeholders for the program/agency/policy under review.</td>
<td>The report identifies limited stakeholders or identifies only an overly broad group of stakeholders (e.g. the people to the state).</td>
<td>The report fails to identify any stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
<th>Fails to Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets:</td>
<td>The report covers all of the areas it claims to cover in the scope and objectives sections.</td>
<td>The report covers most areas it claims to cover in the scope and objectives section.</td>
<td>The report fails to cover most of the areas it claims to cover in the scope and objectives section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>If there are agency comments included, the agency did not dispute the accuracy of the information reported.</td>
<td>The agency disputed the accuracy of some information but the report convincingly rebuts this.</td>
<td>Agency convincingly disputes accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensible</td>
<td>There was “sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence . . . obtained to provide a reasonable basis for the auditors’ findings and conclusions.”</td>
<td>There was competent and relevant information presented but the conclusions go beyond what that evidence supports.</td>
<td>There was not sufficient, competent and relevant information presented to provide a reasonable basis for the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subject Rights</td>
<td>There is no evidence that the report authors violated subjects rights (disclosed confidentiality, presented negative information without opportunity for rebuttal, etc.).</td>
<td>There is some evidence that the report authors violated subjects rights (disclosed confidentiality, presented negative information without opportunity for rebuttal, etc.).</td>
<td>There is strong evidence that the report authors violated subjects rights (disclosed confidentiality, presented negative information without opportunity for rebuttal, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>The report competently addresses evaluations/audits of similar programs/agencies.</td>
<td>The report refers to evaluations/audits of similar programs/agencies but doesn’t address them fully.</td>
<td>The report fails to refer to evaluations/audits of similar programs/agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context Analysis</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> The report presents the context in which the program/policy/agency exists “in enough detail, so that its likely influences on the program can be identified.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> The context is presented in insufficient detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> The report doesn’t present, or only marginally presents, the context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> The report is (1) easy to read and understand, (2) technical terms, abbreviations and acronyms are explained, and (3) the material is logically organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> Only two of the three criteria are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> One or none of the criteria are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concise</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> The report is only as long as is necessary to convey and support conclusions. Needles repetition and extraneous detail are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> The report includes some repetition and extraneous detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> The report includes extensive repetition and/or extraneous detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings and Conclusions</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> Findings are supported by credible evidence related to the report’s objectives. Conclusions are reported as “logical inferences from the findings” not simply a restatement of findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> Findings are supported, but conclusions are mostly a restatement of findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> Findings are insufficiently supported and conclusions are mostly a restatement of findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> Recommendations presented are specific, measurable, and logically follow findings and conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> Recommendations logically follow findings and conclusions but are either unspecific or not measurable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> Recommendation do not logically follow findings and conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness</strong></td>
<td><em>Meets:</em> The report was completed within the requirement (if any) of the authorization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Partially Meets:</em> The report was not completed within the requirements but legitimate reasons are given for this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fails to Meet:</em> The report was not completed with the requirements with no reasonable explanation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>