

Outstanding ATE Evaluation Awards

Rating Instrument

Expert judges will use this instrument to review all submissions.

All evaluations should strive to meet the [Program Evaluation Standards](#) of Utility, Feasibility, Propriety, Accuracy, and Accountability. These standards, while equally important, do not manifest equally in an evaluation's tangible products. Therefore, the selection criteria for the ATE Outstanding Evaluation Award focus on Utility and Accuracy, which can be reasonably judged based on the evaluation's products and stakeholders' feedback.

Judge's name _____

Evaluation under review _____

Based on your review of this evaluation's application materials, rate its quality on the following dimensions:

For items 1 – 8, rate on a scale of Poor – Fair – Good – Very Good – Excellent.

UTILITY

1. The evaluation's overall usefulness, based on testimonials.
2. The evaluation's generation of meaningful information about the project and context.
3. Alignment between the evaluation's stated purpose (or questions) and its conclusions.
4. Overall clarity of the evaluation materials.

ACCURACY

5. Appropriateness of the indicators, data collection, and analysis for the evaluation's purpose (or questions).
6. Justification of the evaluation's conclusions based on the evidence presented.
7. Transparency of the overall evaluation process.

OVERALL QUALITY

For questions #8 and #9, consider aspects that are not asked about above, including but not limited to the evaluation's attention to or measurement of diversity, equity, and inclusion, evaluation scope or depth, cultural competence demonstrated by the evaluation team, technical rigor, visual design and communication of evaluation findings, or attention to NSF's goal of expanding opportunities in STEM to all.

8. What, if any, aspects of this evaluation are especially good and why?

9. What, if any, aspects of this evaluation are especially problematic and why?

10. To what extent would you endorse this evaluation as an example of a high-quality evaluation?

- I do not endorse it and believe it would be unethical to showcase it as a high-quality evaluation.
- I do not endorse it.
- I endorse it with reservations.
- I endorse it without reservations.
- I endorse it without reservation and believe it could benefit the ATE community to showcase it as a high-quality evaluation.

COMMENTS

Use this space to share any other feedback about this evaluation that is relevant for judging its quality. Include issues that should be discussed with other judges in order to reach consensus.