

Key Evaluation Checklist, Part 1 of 2
Program Logic

| Item | Brief Description |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Program Description | The evaluator prepares a corrected description of the program being evaluated. The evaluator begins with the client's description, and ends up with his or her own description after discussions with key stakeholder groups. The purpose is to identify claims in the descriptions provided by the client and stakeholder groups to be verified. |
| Background and Context | This information is the basis for the evaluation design. It includes the evaluation client/sponsor and other stakeholders (roles they play), information needs, intended nature and function of the program, expectations for the evaluation (hopes and fears), resources for the evaluation, program history, and prior evaluation efforts. |
| Program Recipients | The people affected directly and indirectly by what is being evaluated; their needs and values. Differentiate between those targeted and those actually affected. |
| Program and Evaluation Resources | All that could be used by the program, and the resources available for the evaluation inquiry. Strengths assessment. |
| Values | The source of standards for converting facts into evaluative conclusions; preferably relevant, pre-existing, objectively validated. Identify values through needs assessment (not wants), consideration of ideals and professional standards, analysis of function of the program. |
| Program Process | The nature and operation of the program; constraints, costs, benefits. Consider the legal, political, aesthetic, and scientific standards that are applicable. |
| Outcomes | Intended and unintended effects produced by the program. There are different levels of effects that can be included in the inquiry. |

Key Evaluation Checklist, Part 2

| Item | Brief Description |
|------------------|---|
| Costs | Identification of the various things that were used to plan and implement the program that as a consequence were not available for other uses. |
| Comparisons | Strengths and weaknesses of alternative options for addressing the identified needs. Selection of critical competitors may be the most important evaluative act. |
| Generalizability | Utility if used by or for other people, places, times, versions. |
| Significance | A rating of overall importance applied to a synthesis of the above items. |
| Recommendations | (A separate study may be required to develop appropriate recommendations.) Recommendations do not follow automatically from conclusions. |
| Report | Description of communication events for client and audiences. This is as complicated as preparing a description of the program. |
| Meta-evaluation | Critical review of the evaluation itself, preferably prior to implementation, certainly prior to dissemination of findings; preferably by an independent qualified evaluator. |

This brief description is based on these references:

Scriven, Michael. 1983. Evaluation Ideologies. In Madaus, George F.; Scriven, Michael; Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (Eds.). *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation*. 258-260. Sage.

Scriven, Michael. 1991. *Evaluation Thesaurus* (fourth edition). Sage.

Shadish, William R., Jr.; Cook, Thomas D.; Leviton, Laura C. 1991. *Foundations of Program Evaluation: Theories of Practice*. Sage.