EVALUATION PLAN RUBRIC - 575

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Doesn't Meet Expectations
Background description	Description is thorough, accurate, balanced and economical. Description of program goals, life cycle stage, politics, funding, stakeholders & their perspectives, previous evaluations and/or other most relevant contexts help make transparent reasons for proposed evaluation type or approach. Logic model is complete, outcomes discrete and logically linked, helps place evaluation in context. Places evaluation in context of full program scope and shows sensitive insight into that context.	Description touches on major context factors but may be incomplete or miss nuances, and/or inefficiently presented. Context elements may be addressed but their relevance to evaluation not made clear. Background overall supports justification for proposed evaluation type.	Description omits major considerations (whether listed above or not) that should be considered in evaluation approach. Incomplete, inaccurate, biased or formulaic in regards to key considerations. Only tangentially supports choice of evaluation approach.
Evaluation type/ approach	Type of evaluation or approach has been chosen from wide menu of possible information-gathering activities that could serve program. Reasons for not choosing closely competing types briefly addressed. Type chosen is well matched to intended users/ uses, as evidenced by reported iterative discussions leading to understandings established with stakeholders. Reference to AEA utility standards justifies choice.	Evaluation type plausible given description of context, and shows match to context and utility needs / intended uses as linked to evidence from stakeholder / context description. Supported by specific evidence in description. AEA standards mentioned.	Mismatch between discernible program description and type / approach chosen, or choice not adequately justified. Intended users / uses not identified and /or substantiated nor linked to description.

Evaluation question	Question founded on program description and fits evaluation type. Question is clearly stated and broken down into sub-questions. Literature relevant to program theory, similar programs or evaluations, and methodology used and cited. Question has more than one possible answer and can be answered with data. Possible answers are wanted by primary users and address stakeholders' high-utility questions. Question is reasonable and appropriate, reflecting realistic achievements of program. If applicable, question identifies aspects of performance and standards/ criteria relevant to program goals or present utility-needs. Narrative explains	Question reflects context and type considerations though not always fully transparent or justified. Some literature used to support relevant aspects of evaluation. Questions answerable with data, reasonable, and criteria suggested. Questions partially broken down, and related to utility needs and stakeholders' expectations.	Relation of question to context vague or not fully obvious. Relevant literature not cited. Question not answerable by empirical data collection because too vague, poorly defined, ambiguous, or answer predetermined or already known. Stakeholder uses and utility not convincingly addressed / disconnected from question. Question phrased in way that suggests bias to confirm positive impressions of program.
Logic model	Evaluation question mapped to relevant segments of program logic model. These specific elements of model show complete and logical links. Outcomes are stated precisely and rigorously so that indicators can be unambigously matched to them. Inclusion or omission of logic model consistent with evalution type/ question.	Logic model presented but without clear discrimination of relevant portions from program as a whole, or clear rationale for presenting it at all.. Model elements logically related, though may not be so rigorously linked or stated as to allow questions to be unambigously derived from them.	Logic model, if present, does not bear clear relation to evaluation type and question. Model itself shows flaws in logic, steps, outcome formulation, or other aspects.

Evaluation design	Design allows valid and reliable answers to questions, as determined by the methods appropriate to answering the questions. AEA Accuracy standards met. Elements of design clearly described and justified. NOTE: Different designs can call for very different kinds of considerations. In general design strongly supports all inferences to be drawn or focal areas to be explored. Data gathering procedures and instruments presented, their quality and development described and choices regarding them justified. Participants, sampling, comparisons, units of analysis, timing fully addressed as appropriate. Specific valid and reliable data analyses (quantitative	Design allows valid and reliable answers to questions, as determined by the methods appropriate to answering the questions. AEA accuracy standards addressed. Elements of design described and at least partially justified. Design appropriate for questions. In general design supports most inferences to be drawn or focal areas to be explored. Data gathering procedures and instruments presented and justified. Participants, sampling, comparisons, units of analysis, timing addressed as appropriate. Overall, design demonstrates	Design does not allow valid and/or reliable answers to questions, and / or design not appropriate to questions. Design elements partial or not fully developed and/or explained. Procedures, instruments, sampling, comparisons, units, timing, other considerations not appropriately / adequately addressed or justified. Overall, design will likely not allow valid analyses and inferences answering questions.
Anticipated results	Brief description of proposed final writeup included. Imaginable general types of results hypothetically presented to demonstrate that how questions would be answered. Scope of potential conclusions and reasonable recommendations suggested, and linkage to uses clear.	Brief description of proposed final writeup included. Match of possible results to questions explained / demonstrated. Scope of potential conclusions and recommendations suggested and linkage to uses addressed.	No, or weak, description of form of final write up. Weak if any match of anticipated form of results to questions. Potential conclusions, recommendations, or implications for uses of findings not adequately addressed. Pretends to know specific future findings rather than

Feasibility, propriety standards	Answering questions feasible with expectably available resources. Timeline of evaluation included and synchronized to client's likely timeline. Realistic budget includes all activities in evaluation, broken down by person-hour time and types of worker-skill required for each step. Human subjects rights and AEA Propriety standards fully addressed as appropriate.	Feasibility addressed but may not be fully justified. Timeline and budget present and provide plausible framework for completion. HSR and/or AEA Propriety standards addressed as appropriate.	Likely not feasible due to resource, political, financial or other considerations. Timeline and budget not present or minimally developed. Ethical dimensions ignored or weakly developed.
Writing & presentation	Writing is executed clearly and effectively at all levels of organization. Writing is smooth, terminology explained where needed, voice is professional but not distanced or obscure. Conventions followed, including all aspects of APA citation and reference format. Appendices include data collection tools, other supporting materials. Oral presentation effective, engaging, selectively covers most important points.	Writing is fluent, competent in most respects. Overall organization is clear, sentences and paragraphs lack major problems. Voice is generally professional. Writing conventions generally followed, APA format used. Appedices include data collection tools. Presentation competent.	Writing has consistent problems in organization, development, fluency, conventions, citation form. Presentation dull, lax, inaccurate, missing major parts.