

Program evaluation proposal rubric

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
<p>Executive summary, key items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public health problem addressed • Program type and name • The population affected • The evaluation questions • The evaluation design 	<p>All or most key items absent</p> <p>More than one page</p> <p>Descriptions of key items are wordy, not stated in a clear and concise manner</p> <p>Does not summarize the evaluation</p>	<p>Includes some key items and unimportant items, missing important key items</p> <p>More than one page</p> <p>Most descriptions of key items are wordy, some are clear and concise</p> <p>Begins to summarize the evaluation, may include too little or too much detail</p>	<p>Most key items are present, may include a few less important items</p> <p>One page</p> <p>Most descriptions of key items are clear and concise, some are wordy</p> <p>Summarizes the evaluation, may include too little or too much detail</p>	<p>All key items are included</p> <p>One page</p> <p>Descriptions of key items are clear and concise</p> <p>Summarizes the evaluation at the level of detail needed for an executive summary</p>
<p>Introduction, key items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program rationale and magnitude of problem • Program description • Public health relevance • Summary of evaluation design and measures 	<p>Confusing or absent rationale or problem statement</p> <p>Program description absent, unclear or missing major components</p> <p>Explanation of relevance missing, superficial or significantly faulty</p> <p>Evaluation design and measures not well described or confusing description</p>	<p>Partial rationale or problem statement, but not well described</p> <p>Program described but unclear or missing major components</p> <p>Explanation of relevance of the evaluation is superficial or faulty</p> <p>Evaluation design and measures not well described or confusing description</p>	<p>Rationale and problem described reasonably well</p> <p>Program described but some misplaced emphases or inadequacies</p> <p>Explanation of relevance of the evaluation somewhat faulty or limited</p> <p>Evaluation design and measures are clearly and succinctly described</p>	<p>Rationale and magnitude of problem addressed by the program to be evaluated (who is affected) clearly stated</p> <p>Program named and major components succinctly described in particular theory, objectives, type of interventions</p> <p>Public health relevance of evaluation clearly specified including value for prevention and population health, and potential for application beyond this specific program</p> <p>Evaluation design and measures are clearly and succinctly described</p>

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Literature review of evaluations of similar programs	<p>Description of search methods missing, significantly incomplete or search inadequate</p> <p>Missing the most relevant reports; too much is irrelevant or of minor value</p> <p>No systematic approach to review</p> <p>Relevance not discussed or significantly faulty explanation</p>	<p>Description of search methods incomplete or search inadequate</p> <p>A few of the more relevant reports not included; includes some irrelevant reports</p> <p>No systematic approach to review</p> <p>Relevance addressed but not on target</p>	<p>Description of search methods present but somewhat limited</p> <p>Most relevant reports included</p> <p>Reasonably systematic review</p> <p>Relevance explained but discussion of similarities and dissimilarities less systematic or comprehensive</p>	<p>Complete summary of literature search methods (bibliographic databases, search terms, inclusion criteria, quantitative results at each step of search); search is comprehensive</p> <p>Inclusion of all relevant reports of evaluations of similar programs</p> <p>Thorough systematic review of evaluations including description of program evaluated, assessment of quality of reviews, findings and strengths and weaknesses of evaluations</p> <p>Clear and convincing explanation of extent of relevance of literature to this program evaluation; systematic discussion of similarities and dissimilarities</p>
Stakeholders	<p>Important stakeholders not included</p> <p>Arrangements missing, significantly incomplete or inappropriate</p>	<p>Some confusion or uncertainty evident in choice of stakeholders.</p> <p>Minimal description of arrangements</p>	<p>All major stakeholders are included but not all relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Arrangements are adequately but not extensively described and are sound</p>	<p>Relevant stakeholders ("clients" of evaluation) clearly identified and why they are included convincingly explained</p> <p>Arrangements for engaging stakeholders in the evaluation process and assuring stakeholders' needs and interests are addressed are extensively described and are sound</p>

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Program description, key items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program purpose (goals and objectives) • the need being addressed • expected effects • criteria for success • program activities • resources used • logic model • program context 	Many key items are not addressed or descriptions are significantly incomplete or faulty	Not all key items are addressed or descriptions are somewhat incomplete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are reasonably complete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are complete
Evaluation focus, key items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation purpose • questions to be addressed • evaluation standards • who will use findings • how findings will be used • how use of findings will be facilitated • limitations 	Many key items are not addressed or descriptions are significantly incomplete or faulty	Not all key items are addressed or descriptions are somewhat incomplete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are reasonably complete	All key items are addressed and descriptions are complete
Evaluation design	Evaluation design is not clearly specified Evaluation design is inappropriate and does not allow for answering the evaluation questions Limitations are not addressed or are significantly incomplete, inappropriate or erroneous	Evaluation design is not clearly specified Evaluation design allows for answering the evaluation questions but less well than other designs Limitations are described but incomplete	Evaluation design clearly specified Evaluation design allows for answering the evaluation questions Limitations are clearly described	Evaluation design clearly specified (e.g., observational or experimental, etc.) Evaluation design allows for answering the evaluation questions Limitations of evaluation design to answer the evaluation questions are clearly described

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Methods	<p>Descriptions are incomplete or faulty.</p> <p>Methods do not address the evaluation questions</p> <p>Methods do not link to outputs, outcomes or impact being measured</p> <p>Outputs, outcomes and impacts are deficient in description and measureable terms <u>and</u> not clearly related to the evaluation questions</p> <p>Copies of relevant surveys, rubrics, or other measurement tools are not included</p> <p>Methods will not provide reliable and valid data</p>	<p>Descriptions are incomplete or faulty.</p> <p>Methods will address the evaluation questions inadequately</p> <p>Methods have inadequacies</p> <p>Outputs, outcomes and impacts are somewhat deficient in description and measureable terms, <u>and</u> not clearly related to the evaluation questions</p> <p>Copies of some of the relevant surveys, rubrics, or other measurement tools are not included</p> <p>Reliability and validity are questionable</p>	<p>Descriptions are clear and reasonably fully described.</p> <p>Methods will clearly address the evaluation questions</p> <p>Methods are clearly linked</p> <p>Outputs, outcomes or impact are somewhat not well described, not in measurable terms, <u>or</u> less than clearly related to the evaluation questions</p> <p>Copies of relevant surveys, rubrics, or other measurement tools included</p> <p>Reliability and validity are somewhat questionable</p>	<p>The quantitative or qualitative methods and techniques to be used are clearly and fully described.</p> <p>Methods will clearly address the evaluation questions</p> <p>Methods are clearly linked to outputs, outcomes or impact being measured</p> <p>Outputs (products), outcomes (what will be done, findings used for) and impact (what is expected to happen from the evaluation “down the road”) are clearly described and in measurable terms where appropriate and clearly related to the evaluation questions</p> <p>Copies of relevant surveys, rubrics, or other measurement tools included</p> <p>Methods will provide reliable and valid data</p>

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
<p>Logistics, key items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data sources and rationale for their inclusion • Sampling methods and sample size estimates • Data collection techniques 	<p>Many data sources are not specified or the rationale is unconvincing or absent</p> <p>Sampling methods and sample size estimates are absent or in error</p> <p>Data collection techniques are vague or unclear and very likely will produce disappointing results</p>	<p>Many data sources are specified but the rationale for many is limited, unconvincing or faulty</p> <p>Sampling methods are unsound given evaluation objectives or sample size estimates are faulty</p> <p>Data collection techniques are somewhat vague or unclear and likely produce disappointing results</p>	<p>All data sources are specified but there is room for improvement in the description and rationale</p> <p>Sampling methods and sample size estimates are provided and appropriate</p> <p>Data collection techniques are reasonably well described and should provide adequate response</p>	<p>All data sources are clearly specified and the rationale for their inclusion is sound</p> <p>Sampling methods and sample size estimates are provided and appropriate</p> <p>Data collection techniques are clearly and fully described with high potential for success</p>
Analysis and interpretation	<p>Analytic methods are basic and some dummy tables are included, but there are notable errors, faulty approaches, or omissions</p> <p>Approach to interpreting findings missing or seriously deficient</p> <p>Generalizability is not addressed or in a faulty or very cursory manner</p>	<p>Analytic methods are basic and some dummy tables are included, but there are some errors, faulty approaches, or omissions</p> <p>Approach to interpreting findings confusing, unclear or limited</p> <p>Generalizability is addressed but in a limited manner with inadequacies</p>	<p>Analytic methods are reasonable and includes all necessary dummy tables</p> <p>Approach to interpreting findings reasonably well explained</p> <p>Generalizability is somewhat addressed</p>	<p>Methods for analyzing the data are clear and appropriate and includes all necessary dummy tables</p> <p>The perspectives, procedures, and rationale that will be used to interpret findings are carefully described</p> <p>Generalizability of findings is adequately addressed</p>

	Novice	Beginning	Proficient	Expert
Implementation	<p>Evaluation steps are absent or sparsely described</p> <p>Timeline has inconsistencies and is not feasible</p> <p>Responsibilities are unclear and many are not reasonable</p>	<p>Evaluation steps have notable omissions</p> <p>Timeline has inconsistencies and of doubtful feasibility</p> <p>Responsibilities are somewhat unclear and some are not reasonable</p>	<p>Evaluation steps are somewhat incomplete</p> <p>Timeline is provided and appears feasible</p> <p>Most responsibilities are clear</p>	<p>Evaluation steps are comprehensive and complete</p> <p>Timeline for implementation of steps is provided and feasible</p> <p>Individuals or entities and their responsibility for implementation are clearly identified</p>
Strengths and weaknesses of proposed evaluation	<p>Strengths and weaknesses are missing, not clear, wrongly identified or erroneously described</p>	<p>Strengths and weaknesses are somewhat misplaced or misidentified</p>	<p>Not all strengths and weaknesses are identified but those identified are accurate and well described</p>	<p>Strengths and weaknesses of proposed evaluation are accurate and clearly identified and described</p>
Budget	<p>The budget has notable omissions and errors</p> <p>The budget narrative is confusing, unconvincing or unreasonable</p>	<p>The budget has some omissions and errors</p> <p>The budget narrative is incomplete and has inaccuracies or faulty rationales</p>	<p>The budget is complete but perhaps with minor errors or oversights</p> <p>The budget narrative is succinct and mostly appropriate and reasonable</p>	<p>The budget is complete and without errors</p> <p>The budget narrative is succinct, appropriate and reasonable</p>
Human subjects	<p>IRB approval, if needed, is missing</p>	<p>IRB approval, if needed, is missing</p>	<p>IRB approval, if needed, is provided for</p>	<p>IRB approval, if needed, is provided for</p>