

Dallas ISD Program Evaluation Rubric

	Unacceptable	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
Evaluation Plan	No evaluation plan exists	<p>Plan specifies evaluation questions</p> <p>Evaluation questions are not connected to program goals and objectives</p> <p>Plan does not outline approach for answering evaluation questions</p> <p>Plan does not include interim reports as deliverables</p>	<p>Evaluation questions are related to program goals and objectives</p> <p>Plan outlines approach for answering evaluation questions</p> <p>Plan includes interim and final reports as deliverables</p> <p>Timelines estimated for completion of interim and final evaluation reports</p> <p>Interim and final evaluation reports completed on time</p>	<p>Questions are measurable and clearly aligned to program/district goals and objectives</p> <p>Specifies data to be collected and where they are housed</p> <p>Outlines procedures for collecting new data</p> <p>Analysis and reporting procedures described</p> <p>Plan incorporates questions or research needs highlighted in previous evaluations or recent journal literature and documents this</p> <p>Interim and final evaluation reports are completed on time and in line with program needs</p> <p>Plans are reviewed and revised as needed throughout the evaluation process</p>
Methods	Methodology vague, contains no details on evaluation design or methods of analysis	<p>Plan does not specify an evaluation design</p> <p>Plan specifies whether evaluation will be qualitative, quantitative or mixed</p> <p>Plan does not describe data to be collected</p> <p>Plan describes how results of analysis will be reported</p> <p>Methodology sections of evaluation report are general, containing no details on methods used.</p>	<p>Plan specifies evaluation design</p> <p>Plan specifies strengths of the evaluation design chosen</p> <p>Plan specifies needed data for the evaluation</p> <p>Plan describes how data will be analyzed</p> <p>Methodology section of report expands on evaluation plan "data collection" section and clearly describes data sources and analytical methods used.</p>	<p>Evaluation uses most appropriate and rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental designs feasible for use, including randomized control group experiments</p> <p>Plan and report describe strengths and limitations of the evaluation design</p> <p>Data collection and analysis methods are described in the report, along with reasons for their selection</p> <p>Copies of surveys, observation forms and other data collection instruments included in appendix of evaluation report</p>
Stakeholder Engagement	<p>No evidence of contact with program manager or other relevant stakeholders during the evaluation process</p> <p>Key stakeholders not identified</p>	<p>Evaluator consults with program manager on plan</p> <p>Key stakeholders identified</p> <p>Evaluation does not clearly address stakeholder needs</p> <p>Evaluator provides draft of evaluation report to program manager</p>	<p>Evaluator consults with program manager on plan prior to beginning of evaluation work</p> <p>Key stakeholders identified</p> <p>Evaluation clearly addresses stakeholder needs</p> <p>Evaluator provides draft of interim and final evaluation reports to program manager/other stakeholders</p>	<p>Evaluator consults with program manager on evaluation plan prior to beginning of evaluation work</p> <p>Evaluator shares implementation findings and outcomes throughout the evaluation timeline</p> <p>Evaluator communicates findings in a clear, understandable manner that includes recommendations</p> <p>Evaluators keep evaluation managers notified of outcomes of stakeholder contacts throughout the evaluation process</p>
Program Context	<p>No needs statement or rationale for program stated in plan or report</p> <p>Target audience unspecified in plan or report</p> <p>No goals or objectives specified in plan or report</p> <p>No criteria for program success in plan or report</p>	<p>Report includes needs statement</p> <p>Program description expressed in general, boilerplate language</p> <p>No target audience specified</p> <p>Evaluation goals and objectives are expressed in unmeasurable terms</p> <p>Criteria for program success are expressed in vague, unmeasurable terms</p> <p>Literature review not included</p>	<p>Includes needs statement/rationale for program</p> <p>Program description addresses identified problem(s)</p> <p>Target audience specified</p> <p>Program goals and objectives are expressed in clear, measurable terms</p> <p>Literature review included but does not include most recent research on relevant topic(s)</p>	<p>Needs statement demonstrates rationale for program or intervention</p> <p>Report includes discussion of the program description alignment with identified need and describes population to be served</p> <p>Describes program history (where applicable)</p> <p>Literature review includes most recent published research on relevant topics</p> <p>Literature review uses meta-analysis if applicable</p> <p>Specifies criteria for program success</p> <p>Outlines clear, measurable goals and objectives</p>

	Unacceptable	Basic	Proficient	Exemplary
Implementation	Evaluation contains little or no information on program implementation	Describes program activities and services, but no measurable details Evaluation describes population served, includes descriptive statistics	Program operations and services are described and appropriately measured Critical characteristics of program are identified Compares program services and activities with intended design of program Describes program sites and populations served, including descriptive statistics Includes program management perceptions of program operations Evaluation identifies barriers to implementation	Theory of action or logic model describes how program is intended to function Critical characteristics of program are identified and appropriately measured Evaluation describes program sites, populations served and services provided Evaluation compares implementation to intended design Evaluation gauges stakeholder perceptions of program operations and impact Methods of assessing implementation are described Evaluation identifies factors affecting or hampering implementation and offers recommendations for improvement
Data Analysis	Little or no detail on analytical methods used Little attempt to interpret results or findings Evaluation report includes no tables, charts or other data visualization	Analysis mainly descriptive, relying on narrative and descriptive statistics. Higher level statistical analysis appropriate, but not included Charts, graphs or tables not used where appropriate Tables and charts seem to exist solely for “own sake” Explanatory text discusses data and information in charts and tables	Analytic methods include descriptive and inferential techniques, where appropriate Report contains combination of data tables and visual charts that best communicate data and analysis to stakeholders Tables and charts largely self-explanatory Visuals supported by explanatory text that highlights key findings	Methods for analyzing data are described and justified Findings are carefully interpreted and include tables, charts and graphs All visuals are appropriate to data/findings presented Visuals supported by explanatory text that highlights and interprets key findings Charts and tables do not break across pages when doing so can be avoided Explanatory text on same or facing page as chart or table
Findings	Findings are not supported by reported data and analysis.	Findings are vague, descriptive in nature	Report uses data visualization, such as charts and graphs, to illustrate and lend support to findings Findings are supported by multiple data sources, where appropriate, and are related to the original intent of the program Report explains the analytical methods used in findings and describes why these methods are appropriate Findings are expressed in clear, actionable language	Findings come from multiple sources, where appropriate, and are supported by empirical evidence gathered in the evaluation and analysis process Report outlines limitations of analytical methods used to reach findings and conclusions Report identifies areas for future research and evaluation Findings of program effectiveness include cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis, where appropriate. Findings include statements of judgement about merit, worth or significance of program to inform leadership decisions
Recommendations	Evaluation contains no recommendations for program improvement	Recommendations are vague Recommendations not supported by evidence from the evaluation	Recommendations are supported by evidence gathered in the evaluation process Recommendations relate to program goals and objectives Recommendations are expressed in clear, actionable language to inform management and leadership decisions	Recommendations are actionable and supported by empirical evidence Recommendations contain references to supporting evidence Recommendations are tied to program and district goals/objectives Recommendations are tailored to various stakeholder audiences, including program management and district executive leadership Evaluators are prepared to answer questions regarding recommendations

Sources: American Evaluation Association’s Program Evaluation Standards, and the Strategic Data Project’s Data Use Rubric