Rubric to Assess Readiness for an Evaluation

This rubric can be used to assess a program or project's readiness for an evaluation. The cumulative score will indicate the overall level of readiness. The individual ratings will indicate areas where preparation is nearly complete or further attention is needed. If the score is in the lower or even middle range, the NOAA Office for Coastal Management's Planning for Meaningful Evaluation training can provide more detailed information and practice with the steps outlined in this guide.

Evaluation Plan Rubric			Rating
1. Evaluation Questions	Identification of requestor	1 – Needs improvement 2 – Identified many, not just requestor/decision maker(s) 3 – Identified only those who *need* the evaluation to make a decision affecting the program	
	Identification of what requestor needs to know	1 – Needs improvement 2 – Needs articulated, but lengthy and imprecise 3 – Succinct articulation of *their* need and for what type of decision	
	Prioritization of evaluation questions	1 – Needs improvement 2 – Too many priority questions 3 – One or few, clearly prioritized	
2. Context	Adequacy	Refer to the bulleted items in Step 2 of this document, write the number of items that have been adequately addressed (0-5)	
3. Project or Program Plans (e.g., logic model)	Identification of plan components that link to the evaluation questions	Connection between evaluation questions and relevant part of plan is 1 – Loose 2 – Sound 3 – Strong	
	Definition and logical connection	Each string of items supporting the evaluation questions is 1 – Poorly defined with causal gaps 2 – Some weak definitions and weak causal connections between items 3 – Well defined with strong cause-and-effect relationships between items	
	Realism and completeness of timelines	Time estimates are 1 – None or one of the following: complete, realistic, well-founded 2 – Two of the following: complete, realistic, well-founded 3 – Complete, realistic, and well-founded	
	Credibility of assumptions	1 – Flawed or outdated assumptions 2 – Credible, well-founded assumptions 3 – Well-founded assumptions are articulated and supported with evidence-based approaches	

Evaluation Plan Rubric			Rating
4. Other Influences	Sufficiency	1 – Insufficient accounting of internal or external influences 2 – Sufficient accounting of internal or external 3 – Sufficient accounting of internal and external	
5. Performance Measures	Supportive of evaluation questions	Link to evaluation questions 1 – needs improvement: some or many performance measures are irrelevant 2 – adequate: supportive of evaluation questions but could be improved 3 – strong: handful of directly supportive performance measures	
	Data source definition	How clearly defined are sources of performance measurement data? 1 – Needs improvement 2 – Adequately defined 3 – Clearly defined	
6. Data Collection and Analysis	Instruments	1 – Uses one source of data 2 – Uses two sources of data 3 – Uses triangulation to gather data	
		Given the type of evaluation questions, the instrument choices are 1 – Fair to poor 2 – Mix of good and fair or poor 3 – All are rated good given the type of questions	
	Methods	1 – Uniform: measures either all quantitative or all qualitative 3 – Mixed: makes use of both qualitative and quantitative measures	
7. Communicate Results	Knowledge of requestor needs, and report format and outline	1 – No knowledge of evaluation requestor needs or preferences 2 – Knowledge of evaluation requestor needs and preferences but no plan for format 3 – Well developed outline and format based on needs of evaluation requestor	
Evaluation Plan Readiness	Cumulative Score (14-47)		

Score:

47-36 – Share and confirm with evaluation requestors and start evaluating!

35-24 – Off to a good start, but there is still some work to do.

< 23 – More preparation is needed before committing resources to an evaluation.