ATE Proposal Evaluation Plan Rubric

EvaluATE | July 2021

Purpose

This rubric was used as part of a study conducted by EvaluATE in partnership with The Rucks Group. The study examined characteristics of a sample of ATE evaluation proposals funded 2004 through 2017. The rubric was used to assess evaluation-related content in the 15-page project descriptions of ATE proposals. The rubric is being shared as an educational reference for those who want to understand how this study was conducted.

EVALUATION ELEMENT	Rating Description and Point Value			
	Missing *No information related to this element is provided.* **Score = 0**	**Minimally Present** *Minimal information related to this element is provided, with key information either missing or unclear.* **Score = 1**	**Mostly Present** *Most of the information related to this element is present but it may be vague or missing important elements.* **Score = 2**	**Fully Present** *All essential aspects of the element are present and sufficiently clear.* **Score = 3**
1. Evaluator: Identification of an individual, team, or organization who will lead the project's external evaluation, and their qualifications	An evaluator is not identified. (Skip to Item 1b)	An evaluator is identified, but no evaluation-specific qualifications are identified. (Skip to Item 2)	An evaluator is identified, and some evaluation-specific qualifications are identified but not substantiated ("Dr. Smith is a highly qualified and experienced evaluator"). (Skip to Item 2)	An evaluator is identified, and evidence to substantiate their evaluation-specific qualifications is provided, such as examples of evaluation experience, advanced training, or leadership in the evaluation field (e.g., "Dr. Smith has evaluated projects funded by NSF's ADVANCE, ITEST, and ATE programs"). (Skip to Item 2
1b. Post-award evaluator selection process: Description of how an evaluator will be selected after the NSF grant is awarded	There is no mention that an evaluator will be needed or description of how the evaluator role will be filled after an award is made.	The need to obtain an evaluator is noted, but there is no description of how an evaluator will be selected.	The process by which an evaluator will be selected is identified (e.g., through a call for proposals or selection of someone the institution has used in the past), but there is no mention of the criteria that will be used to make the selection or what evaluation-specific qualifications will be sought.	The process by which an evaluator will be selected is described, including the criteria that will be used to make the selection to ensure the evaluator is qualified (e.g., evaluation-specific experience or education).

EVALUATION ELEMENT	Rating Description and Point Value			
	Missing *No information related to this element is provided.* **Score = 0**	**Minimally Present** *Minimal information related to this element is provided, with key information either missing or unclear.* **Score = 1**	**Mostly Present** *Most of the information related to this element is present but it may be vague or missing important elements.* **Score = 2**	**Fully Present** *All essential aspects of the element are present and sufficiently clear.* **Score = 3**
2. Evaluation focus: Identification of what aspects of the project will be addressed in the evaluation. The focus could be expressed as evaluation questions, purpose statements, objectives, or criteria.	The evaluation's focus is not identified.	The evaluation's focus is noted only in general terms (e.g., "will determine whether goals were met," "assess the quality of process and outcomes," or "the evaluation will be formative or summative").	Specific evaluation purpose statements, objectives, criteria, and/or questions specific to the project are presented, but the focus is limited to either implementation or outcomes without a rationale for the singular focus.	The evaluation's focus is defined through explicit evaluation purpose statements, objectives, criteria, and/or questions specific to the project and addresses both implementation and outcomes (or a rationale for a focus on one and not the other is provided).
3. Data collection: Identification of what information will be collected, how it will be collected, from what sources, and what it will be used to measure	There is no mention of specific types of data, data sources, or collection methods that will be used in the evaluation.	Some specific data collection methods are mentioned, but data sources, are not specified (or vice versa), *and/or* it is unclear what is going to be measured (e.g., "a student survey will be conducted").	Specific data sources and collection methods are identified, and it is clear what *most* of the data will be used to measure (such as "students will be surveyed to assess their interest in STEM"), but it is not clear what *some* types of data will be used to measure *or* important aspects of the evaluation's focus are not addressed in the data collection plan	Specific data sources and collection methods are identified, and it is clear what all the data will be used to measure *and* all important aspects of the evaluation's focus are addressed in the data collection plan

EVALUATION ELEMENT	Rating Description and Point Value			
	Missing *No information related to this element is provided.* **Score = 0**	**Minimally Present** *Minimal information related to this element is provided, with key information either missing or unclear.* **Score = 1**	**Mostly Present** *Most of the information related to this element is present but it may be vague or missing important elements.* **Score = 2**	**Fully Present** *All essential aspects of the element are present and sufficiently clear.* **Score = 3**
4. Data analysis or interpretation: Identification of what will be done with the data after it is collected to address the evaluation's focus	There is no mention of what will be done with the data after it is collected.	There is only a vague reference to analysis or interpretation (e.g., "the evaluator will analyze data…" or "results will be interpreted…").	There is at least some explanation of how raw data will be analyzed or interpreted to reach conclusions in relation to at least one aspect of the evaluation's focus (e.g., "results will be compared with national trends and peer institutions" or "outcomes for participants and nonparticipants will be compared"), but it is not clear how the findings will be used to reach conclusions related to the evaluation's focus.	There is an explicit plan for how findings will be used to reach conclusions (such as comparing findings with performance targets or benchmarks; establishing an effect size threshold; developing rubrics; or engaging stakeholders in reviewing findings) to address aspects of the evaluation's focus.
5. Reporting: Identification of how, when, and to whom the evaluation results will be communicated	There is no mention of formal or informal reporting.	Reporting is mentioned, but in a non-specific way (e.g., "the evaluator will share results with project stakeholders").	The frequency of evaluation reporting is noted, with reports delivered to project leadership (project teams and NSF) at least annually, but there is no mention of further dissemination.	As well as at least annual reporting to project leaders, there is a stated intention to disseminate evaluation results (not just "project results") to other groups who could learn from the results.
6. Use: Identification of how information from the evaluation will be used by project personnel.	There is no implicit or explicit indication of intent to use the evaluation results.	There is an implicit suggestion that the evaluation results will be used for project improvement because the evaluation is described as formative.	There is a specific statement that the evaluation results will be used by project personnel (e.g., "results will be used for project improvement"), but no specific use is mentioned.	An explicit intended use of the evaluation results is identified (e.g., "evaluation results will be reviewed quarterly to identify ways to improve outreach").