

Outstanding ATE Evaluation Awards

Rating Instrument

Expert judges will use this instrument to review all submissions.

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 – 7, rate on a scale of Poor – Fair – Good – Very Good – Excellent.

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.
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.

For questions 8-9, also consider other aspects of the nominated evaluation, such as the following:

- attention to culture, diversity, equity, or inclusion
 - visual design and clarity of writing
 - the extent to which the evaluation embodied the [Guiding Principles for Evaluators](#) (issued by the American Evaluation Association) and the [Program Evaluation Standards](#), (developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation)
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.