

## PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SUMMARY METAEVALUATION CHECKLIST

**(Based on *The Program Evaluation Standards*)**

**Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Social Impact  
2012**

*This summary checklist is for performing final, summative metaevaluations. It is organized according to the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards. For each of the standards the most important checkpoints are indicated. 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 Responsive and Inclusive Orientation, A1 Justified Conclusions and Decisions, A2 Valid Information, or A8 Communication and Reporting. Users of this checklist are advised to consult the full text of *The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2011)*, *The Program Evaluation Standards: A Guide for Evaluators and Evaluation Users*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.*

### TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR UTILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:

#### U1 Evaluator Credibility

- Engage evaluator whom the stakeholders trust
- 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
- Attend appropriately to stakeholders' criticisms and suggestions
- 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

#### U2 Attention to Stakeholders

- Clearly identify the evaluation client
- Consult potential stakeholders to identify their information needs
- With the client, rank stakeholders for relative importance
- Arrange to involve stakeholders throughout the evaluation
- Address stakeholders' evaluation needs

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

#### U3 Negotiated Purposes

- Monitor and describe how the evaluation's purposes stay the same or change over time
- As appropriate, update evaluation procedures to accommodate changes in the evaluation's purposes
- Record the actual evaluation procedures, as implemented
- Describe the evaluation's purposes and procedures in the summary and full-length evaluation reports

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

#### U4 Explicit Values

- Consider alternative sources of values for interpreting evaluation findings
- Reference pertinent laws
- Reference, as appropriate, the relevant institutional mission
- Reference the program's goals
- 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 Relevant Information**

- Interview stakeholders to determine their different perspectives
- 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 and worth

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

**U6 Meaningful Processes and Products**

- Clearly report the essential information
- Issue brief, simple, and direct reports
- Focus reports on contracted questions
- Describe the evaluation's purposes, procedures, and findings
- Support conclusions and recommendations
- Provide an executive summary

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

**U7 Timely and Appropriate Communicating and Reporting**

- Make timely interim reports to intended users
- Deliver the final report when it is needed
- Have timely exchanges with the program's staff
- Have timely exchanges with the program's customers
- Keep the presentations appropriately brief

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

**U8 Concern for Consequences and Influence**

- Encourage and support stakeholders' use of the 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

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 (0-8) _____ x 4 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 (93%) to 32: <b>Excellent</b>
Number of Very Good (0-8) _____ x 3 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 22 (68%) to 29: <b>Very Good</b>
Number of Good (0-8) _____ x 2 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 (50%) to 21: <b>Good</b>
Number of Fair (0-8) _____ x 1 = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 (25%) to 15: <b>Fair</b>
Total Score: _____ = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 7: <b>Poor</b>
<b>_____ (Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ x 100 = _____</b>	

***TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FEASIBILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:***

**F1 Project Management**

- Consistently relate to all stakeholders in a professional manner
- Minimize disruption
- Honor participants' privacy rights
- Be alert to and address participants' concerns about the evaluation
- 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

**F2 Practical Procedures**

- Tailor methods and instruments to information requirements
- Minimize the data burden
- Appoint competent staff
- Choose procedures in light of known constraints
- Make a realistic schedule
- Engage locals to help conduct the evaluation

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

**F3 Contextual Viability**

- Avert or counteract attempts to bias or misapply the findings
- Agree on editorial and dissemination authority
- Report divergent views

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

**F4 Resource Use**

- Be efficient
- Inform decisions
- Foster program improvement
- Generate new insights
- Minimize time demands on program personnel

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

<b>Scoring the Evaluation for FEASIBILITY</b> <b>Add the following:</b>	<b>Strength of the evaluation's provisions for FEASIBILITY</b>
Number of Excellent ratings (0-4) _____ x 4 = _____ Number of Very Good (0-4) _____ x 3 = _____ Number of Good (0-4) _____ x 2 = _____ Number of Fair (0-4) _____ x 1 = _____ Total Score: _____ = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 (93%) to 16: <b>Excellent</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 11 (68%) to 14: <b>Very Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (50%) to 10: <b>Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 4 (25%) to 7: <b>Fair</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 3: <b>Poor</b> _____ (Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ x 100 = _____

***TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPRIETY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:***

**P1 Responsive and Inclusive Orientation**

- Assess program outcomes against targeted customers' assessed needs
- Make the evaluation's service orientation clear to stakeholders
- Identify program strengths to build on
- Identify program weaknesses to correct

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
- Evaluation reports
- Release of reports
- Evaluation procedures and schedule
- Confidentiality/anonymity of data
- Evaluation resources

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

**P3 Human Rights and Respect**

- Clarify intended uses of the evaluation
- Keep stakeholders informed
- Respect diversity
- Honor confidentiality/anonymity agreements
- Do no harm

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

**P4 Clarity and Fairness**

- Assess and report the program's strengths
- Assess and report the program's weaknesses
- Report on intended outcomes
- Report on unintended outcomes

- Appropriately address criticisms of the draft report
- 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

**P5 Transparency and Disclosure**

- 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

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

**P6 Conflicts of Interests**

- 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
- When appropriate, release evaluation procedures, data, and reports for public review

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

**P7 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
- Maintain accurate records of sources of funding and expenditures
- Maintain adequate personnel records concerning job allocations and time spent on the job
- Be frugal in expending evaluation resources

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

<p><b>Scoring the Evaluation for PROPRIETY</b>  <b>Add the following:</b></p> <p>Number of Excellent ratings (0-7) _____ x 4 = _____</p> <p>Number of Very Good (0-7) _____ x 3 = _____</p> <p>Number of Good (0-7) _____ x 2 = _____</p> <p>Number of Fair (0-7) _____ x 1 = _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total Score: _____ = _____</p>	<p><b>Strength of the evaluation's provisions for PROPRIETY</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 26 (93%) to 28:                    <b>Excellent</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 19 (68%) to 25:                    <b>Very Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 14 (50%) to 18:                    <b>Good</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7 (25%) to 13:                    <b>Fair</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 6:                    <b>Poor</b></p> <p>_____ (Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ x 100 = _____</p>
--	--

**TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCURACY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:**

**A1 Justified Conclusions and Decisions**

<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"/>	Report plausible alternative explanations of the findings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Explain why rival explanations were rejected
<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 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"/>	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"/>	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"/>	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 Reliable Information**

<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"/>	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"/>	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 Explicit Program and Content Descriptions**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Collect descriptions of the intended program from the client and various stakeholders
<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 how the program was intended to operate and how it actually operated
<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 Information Management**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Obtain information from a variety of sources
<input type="checkbox"/>	As appropriate, employ a variety of data collection methods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Document, justify, and report the criteria and methods used to select information sources
<input type="checkbox"/>	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
- Systematize and control storage of the evaluation information

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

**A6 Sound Designs and Analyses**

- 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
- Choose procedures appropriate for the evaluation questions and nature of the data
- Obtain information keyed to the important evaluation questions

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

**A7 Explicit Evaluation Reasoning**

- 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
- Use visual displays to clarify the presentation and interpretation of statistical results
- Derive conclusions and recommendations and demonstrate their meaningfulness

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

**A8 Communication and Reporting**

- Safeguard reports from deliberate or inadvertent distortions
- Report perspectives of all stakeholder groups
- Report alternative plausible conclusions
- 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

<p><b>Scoring the Evaluation for ACCURACY</b> Add the following:</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 evaluation's provisions for ACCURACY</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 style="text-align: center;">_____ (Total score) ÷ 44 = _____ x 100 = _____</p>
---	---

***TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR EVALUATION ACCOUNTABILITY, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS SHOULD:***

**E1 Evaluation Documentation**

<input type="checkbox"/> Collect descriptions of the implemented evaluation designs <input type="checkbox"/> Collect descriptions of the evaluation procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Fully record all data collected <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze the data and record outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Produce a technical report that provides information on the evaluation design, procedures, data and 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	
<b>E2 Internal 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"/> Budget appropriately and sufficiently for conducting the metaevaluation	
<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>E3 External Metaevaluation</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Budget appropriately and sufficiently for conducting the metaevaluation <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	
<b>Scoring the Evaluation for EVALUATION ACCOUNTABILITY</b> Add the following:	<b>Strength of the evaluation's provisions for EVALUATION ACCOUNTABILITY</b>
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: _____ = _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 (93%) to 12: <b>Excellent</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 8 (68%) to 10: <b>Very Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 6 (50%) to 7: <b>Good</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 3 (25%) to 5: <b>Fair</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 (0%) to 2: <b>Poor</b>  _____ (Total score) ÷ 12 = _____ 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 the user and specifically disclaims any such warranties or representations.*