

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) Program Evaluation Standards*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.*

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR UTILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS 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
- 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

<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

U7 Evaluation Impact

<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

Scoring the Evaluation for UTILITY

Add the following:

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 =	_____
Total score:		=	_____

Strength of the evaluation's provisions for UTILITY:

<input type="checkbox"/> 26 (93%) to 28:	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/> 19 (68%) to 25:	Very Good
<input type="checkbox"/> 14 (50%) to 18:	Good
<input type="checkbox"/> 7 (25%) to 13:	Fair
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 5:	Poor
_____ (Total score) ÷ 28 = _____ x 100 = _____	

TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FEASIBILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:

F1 Practical Procedures

<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

<input type="checkbox"/> Give interim feedback for program improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Expose harmful practices <input type="checkbox"/> Inform all right-to-know audiences of the program's positive and negative outcomes
<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
P2 Formal Agreements, reach advance written agreements on:
<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation purpose and questions <input type="checkbox"/> Audiences <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation reports <input type="checkbox"/> Editing <input type="checkbox"/> Release of reports <input type="checkbox"/> 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
P3 Rights of Human Subjects
<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
P4 Human Interactions
<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

P5 Complete and Fair Assessment				
<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	
P6 Disclosure of Findings				
<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	
P7 Conflict of Interest				
<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	

P8 Fiscal Responsibility	
<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	
Scoring the Evaluation for PROPRIETY Add the following: Number of Excellent ratings (0-8) _____ x 4 = _____ Number of Very Good (0-8) _____ x 3 = _____ Number of Good (0-8) _____ x 2 = _____ Number of Fair (0-8) _____ x 1 = _____ Total score: = _____	Strength of the evaluation's provisions for PROPRIETY <input type="checkbox"/> 30 (93%) to 32: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> 22 (68%) to 29: Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> 16 (50%) to 21: Good <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (25%) to 15: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 7: Poor _____ (Total score) ÷ 32 = _____ x 100 = _____
<i>TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCURACY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:</i>	
A1 Program Documentation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Collect descriptions of the intended program from various written sources <input type="checkbox"/> Collect descriptions of the intended program from the client and various stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Describe how the program was intended to function <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain records from various sources of how the program operated <input type="checkbox"/> As feasible, engage independent observers to describe the program's actual operations <input type="checkbox"/> Describe how the program actually functioned <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze discrepancies between the various descriptions of how the program was intended to function <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze discrepancies between how the program was intended to operate and how it actually operated <input type="checkbox"/> Ask the client and various stakeholders to assess the accuracy of recorded descriptions of both the intended and the actual program <input type="checkbox"/> Produce a technical report that documents the program's operations	
<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	
A2 Context Analysis	
<input type="checkbox"/> Use multiple sources of information to describe the program's context <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the context's technical, social, political, organizational, and economic features <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain a log of unusual circumstances <input type="checkbox"/> Record instances in which individuals or groups intentionally or otherwise interfered with the program <input type="checkbox"/> Record instances in which individuals or groups intentionally or otherwise gave special assistance to the program	

<input type="checkbox"/>	Analyze how the program's context is similar to or different from contexts where the program might be adopted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Report those contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the program and that might be of interest to potential adopters
<input type="checkbox"/>	Estimate effects of context on program outcomes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Identify and describe any critical competitors to this program that functioned at the same time and in the program's environment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Describe how people in the program's general area perceived the program's existence, importance, and quality
<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

A3 Described Purposes and Procedures

<input type="checkbox"/>	At the evaluation's outset, record the client's purposes for the evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Monitor and describe stakeholders' intended uses of evaluation findings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Monitor and describe how the evaluation's purposes stay the same or change over time
<input type="checkbox"/>	Identify and assess points of agreement and disagreement among stakeholders regarding the evaluation's purposes
<input type="checkbox"/>	As appropriate, update evaluation procedures to accommodate changes in the evaluation's purposes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Record the actual evaluation procedures, as implemented
<input type="checkbox"/>	When interpreting findings, take into account the different stakeholders' intended uses of the evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/>	When interpreting findings, take into account the extent to which the intended procedures were effectively executed
<input type="checkbox"/>	Describe the evaluation's purposes and procedures in the summary and full-length evaluation reports
<input type="checkbox"/>	As feasible, engage independent evaluators to monitor and evaluate the evaluation's purposes and procedures
<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

A4 Defensible Information Sources

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

A5 Valid Information

<input type="checkbox"/>	Focus the evaluation on key questions
<input type="checkbox"/>	As appropriate, employ multiple measures to address each question
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide a detailed description of the constructs and behaviors about which information will be acquired
<input type="checkbox"/>	Assess and report what type of information each employed procedure acquires
<input type="checkbox"/>	Train and calibrate the data collectors
<input type="checkbox"/>	Document and report the data collection conditions and process
<input type="checkbox"/>	Document how information from each procedure was scored, analyzed, and interpreted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Report and justify inferences singly and in combination

<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Establish meaningful categories of information by identifying regular and recurrent themes in information collected using qualitative assessment procedures
<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
A6 Reliable Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify and justify the type(s) and extent of reliability claimed <input type="checkbox"/> For each employed data collection device, specify the unit of analysis <input type="checkbox"/> As feasible, choose measuring devices that in the past have shown acceptable levels of reliability for their intended uses <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Check and report the consistency of scoring, categorization, and coding <input type="checkbox"/> 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
A7 Systematic Information
<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
A8 Analysis of Quantitative Information
<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

A9 Analysis of Qualitative Information					
<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"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3-4 Fair
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>		0-2 Poor
A10 Justified Conclusions					
<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 Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	7-8 Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	5-6 Good
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3-4 Fair
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>		0-2 Poor
A11 Impartial Reporting					
<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 Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	7-8 Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	5-6 Good
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	3-4 Fair
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>		0-2 Poor

A12 Metaevaluation			
<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 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		
Scoring the Evaluation for ACCURACY		Strength of the evaluation's provisions for ACCURACY	
Add the following:			
Number of Excellent ratings (0-12)	_____ x 4 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	45 (93%) to 48: Excellent
Number of Very Good (0-12)	_____ x 3 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	33 (68%) to 44: Very Good
Number of Good (0-12)	_____ x 2 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	24 (50%) to 32: Good
Number of Fair (0-12)	_____ x 1 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	12 (25%) to 23: Fair
Total score:	= _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 (0%) to 11: Poor
		_____	(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.