

UWCM Quick Checklist for Evaluability Assessment

March 2025

The Impact Strategy Program Manager and SIA DART members can use this checklist to guide the assessment of program readiness for evaluation. A program may not address or meet all criteria in a given section, depending on whether it is a new or an existing program and what stage of development and implementation it is in. Please consider the core criteria that are necessary based on the intended program design. Missing or lack of readiness on a number of criteria indicates areas for development prior to evaluation.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Readiness Criteria	Does not meet criterion	Questionably meets criterion	Meets criterion
Clear, coherent, and comprehensive program design (supported by a logic model) and theory of change. Strategies and activities are designed to address a defined need. There are logical connections between strategies and activities and the intended results or changes in outcomes. Goals and objectives are articulated and attainable with the available resources.			
Outcomes are relevant to the program's goals and objectives and clearly expressed in the program's logic model as short, medium, and long-term outcomes.			
Target population is identified. Program participation is clearly defined and distinguishable from non-participation.			
There is agreement across program leadership and staff about core elements of the program and the context in which it operates.			
There is agreement across program leadership and staff about what outcomes are expected and on what outcomes data should be collected.			
There is a clearly defined timeframe associated with program activities and/or participation in them.			
There is reasonable and shared expectation around the timeframe for when observable/measurable outcomes in short, medium, or long term will occur.			
There is shared understanding across stakeholders regarding the existing evidence behind the program design or logic model.			

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Readiness Criteria	Does not meet criterion	Questionably meets criterion	Meets criterion
The program resources discussed in the program design are available.			
The program resources are sufficient and sustainable.			
Staff are qualified and properly trained to operate the program. There are enough qualified staff to implement the program.			
Implementing partners are qualified and properly trained to execute the program activities. There are enough qualified staff to implement the program activities.			
The program serves the target population for whom it was designed.			
The program (or components of a program to be evaluated) have been in operation for a reasonable length of time and is known in the target population or has clear evidence of uptake and effectiveness in other similar populations.			
If the program is in the early stages or is currently being adapted, expected changes were informed by research, theory, or other systematically obtained evidence along lines that can be documented and quantified.			
If the program is relatively mature and stable, activities are repeatable and likely to produce the same effects over time.			
Risks/threats to program delivery are identified, and risk monitoring and mitigation processes are proposed or in place.			
Contextual factors and influences are accounted for and assessed as relatively stable. These forces are not expected to affect the program and its stakeholders in a significantly different way over time.			



United Way
of Central Maryland

MEASURES AND DATA

Readiness Criteria	Does not meet criterion	Questionably meets criterion	Meets criterion
There are measures and data systems in place to track program implementation.			
There are procedures in place to determine if target population is served.			
Data that track activities, outputs, and participation is collected.			
Feedback is sought on a routine basis to understand how program participants experience activities and outputs to address any problems in a timely manner.			
Outcomes are defined in quantifiable, measurable terms, and procedures for measuring outcomes have been implemented.			
Current outcome measures are relevant and valid indicators of progress toward program goal(s).			
The program selects current outcome measures and targets in conjunction with external effectiveness standards, if available.			
Performance data (i.e., performance measures) are routinely collected.			
Systems, tools, and processes are in place to support data collection, storage, processing, analysis, and reporting, and staff members are trained to use the systems properly and consistently.			



United Way
of Central Maryland

IF OUTCOME EVALUATION IS PROPOSED/PLANNED:

Readiness Criteria	Does not meet criterion	Questionably meets criterion	Meets criterion
A process evaluation has been (or is currently being) conducted to ensure the program is implemented as planned, reaching the target population, likely to affect results, and to assess program participation. The evaluation showed/ shows			
The program is serving/reaching the target population.			
Planned activities are implemented as intended and with sufficient amount and quality.			
Program participants and other stakeholders are satisfied with the program.			
Program participants and other stakeholders report positive benefits and unintended effects that align with outcomes.			
There is a compelling case for allocating resources for an outcome evaluation (e.g., demand for answering questions related to achievement of, changes in, or variation in outcomes.)			
The program is designed such that periods of baseline and follow-up data collection can be defined (e.g., for pre-post or time series evaluation designs)			

IF IMPACT EVALUATION IS PROPOSED/PLANNED:

Readiness Criteria	Does not meet criterion	Questionably meets criterion	Meets criterion
An outcome evaluation has been conducted (or is being conducted).			
The evaluation shows there is evidence that the program is producing desired results (i.e., quantifiable change in outcomes) for program participants.			
The evaluation shows there is a compelling case for allocating resources for an impact evaluation (e.g., demand for answering causal impact questions, precision of and confidence in results could not be achieved with nonexperimental outcome evaluation).			
The program is delivered at a scale such that there are enough individuals and/or sites participating in the program (depending on the unit of analysis) to allow for comparison or control group analysis. In other words, the program is of sufficient size that can leave enough potential participants and/or sites unserved to allow the formation of a matched comparison or randomly assigned control group of sufficient size to make statistical comparisons and impact measurement possible.			
If denying entitlements/benefits to participants is legally restricted, alternative ways of delivering or enhancing the program (e.g., expanded eligibility criteria for benefits, phased role out of program benefits, encouragement designs, A/B testing, etc.) may still be permitted			
The formation of a matched comparison or randomly assigned control group does not create conditions of greater risk or increased cost to program participants.			
The comparison or control group can be formed from individuals who are within the same setting, community, or other comparable grouping as the participating group.			
If a randomized control trial is to be conducted, sites are on board with the approach and ready to work with evaluators to assign eligible participants to treatment and control groups.			
If the program cannot be assigned randomly, sufficient sample size and amount of background data (e.g., biasing factors such as participants' demographic characteristics) will be available for statistical adjustment and analysis during the evaluation.			
Evaluation questions consider both process and outcomes to understand how, why, and possible cause and effect of the program.			
Disaggregated financial and non-financial cost data are available. Outputs and/or changes in outcomes are quantifiable to allow "cost per output" (cost efficiency) or "per outcome" (cost effectiveness) computation.			



United Way
of Central Maryland

References

- BetterEvaluation. (n.d.). Evaluability assessment. Retrieved from https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/evaluability_assessment
- U.S. Department of State. (2018). CSO evaluability assessment checklist (working draft) [PDF]. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/CSO-Evaluability-Assessment-Checklist-Working-Draft.pdf>
- United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (n.d.). Evaluability assessments guidance [PDF].
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (n.d.). Evaluability checklist [Document].
- White, H., Menon, R., & Waddington, H. (2015). Evaluability assessment for impact evaluation: Guidance, checklists and decision support. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281643380_EVALUABILITY_ASSESSMENT_FOR_IMPACT_EVALUATION_GUIDANCE_CHECKLISTS_AND_DECISION_SUPPORT