



Organization Name

Program/Project

Evaluability Assessment Tool

Date

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Evaluability Assessment | 3 |
| Organization Readiness | 3 |
| Leadership Readiness | 4 |
| Program Design Readiness | 5 |
| Program Implementation Readiness | 6 |
| Program Data Readiness | 7 |
| Program Evaluation Readiness | 8 |
| Program Reporting and Use Readiness | 9 |
| Evaluability Assessment Results | 10 |
| Acknowledgements | 11 |

Evaluability Assessment

Organization Readiness

Key Question: Does the organization have the resources, infrastructure, and culture necessary to support a well-planned and meaningful evaluation?

This section examines whether the organization has the capacity, staffing, and supportive culture to undertake an evaluation. It considers whether the program fits within organizational priorities and whether there is alignment around using evaluation findings for improvement.

| 1. Organization | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) Our organization has a clear mission and vision that align with this program/project. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Leadership supports evaluation and values learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) The organization has experience using data to make decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Staff capacity (internal or external) is available to support evaluation tasks. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Sufficient financial resources can be allocated for evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) A culture of learning exists beyond compliance requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) The organization has documented policies for data privacy, ethics, or responsible evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) Cross-department collaboration (e.g., IT, Finance, HR) supports the program's success. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Average | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Leadership Readiness

Key Question: Are organizational leaders aligned, supportive, and actively engaged in both the program and its evaluation?

Leadership buy-in is critical for a successful evaluation. This section assesses whether leaders provide clear direction, allocate necessary resources, and demonstrate commitment to using evaluation results for decision-making.

| 2. Leadership | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) Program leadership understands the purpose and value of evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Leadership is willing to adjust the program based on evaluation findings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) An evaluation “champion” exists to support and facilitate the process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Key stakeholders (funders, board, partners) support the decision to evaluate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Leadership is prepared to have transparent conversations about program limitations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) A governance or decision-making structure exists for acting on findings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) Program leadership understands the purpose and value of evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) Leadership is willing to adjust the program based on evaluation findings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Average | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Program Design Readiness

Key Question: Is the program clearly defined, with documented goals, a logic model, and a coherent theory of change?

A program must be well-structured to be meaningfully evaluated. This section asks whether goals, objectives, and expected outcomes are articulated, and whether the underlying assumptions and program theory are documented.

| 3. Program Design | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) A logic model, theory of change, or similar framework exists. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Program goals, objectives, and intended beneficiaries are clearly articulated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) The causal rationale for how the program leads to outcomes is defined. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Indicators for outputs and outcomes exist. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Priority outcomes for evaluation are clearly identified. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) Target populations are clearly defined (eligibility, selection criteria). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) Key assumptions underlying the program design are documented. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) External contextual factors (e.g., partner roles, environment) are known and documented. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Average | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Program Implementation Readiness

Key Question: Is the program being implemented as intended, with consistent procedures and fidelity across sites or staff?

Effective evaluation requires that a program is being delivered consistently. This section assesses whether implementation aligns with the design and whether variations or deviations could affect evaluation validity.

| 4. Program Implementation | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) The program has been implemented long enough to evaluate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Implementation is consistent across staff, sites, or partners. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Program activities and service delivery are tracked and documented. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) A mechanism exists for staff to provide feedback to leadership. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Risks or barriers to implementation are monitored and addressed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) Standard operating procedures (SOPs) or implementation manuals are available. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) Adaptations or deviations from the intended model are tracked. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Average | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Program Data Readiness

Key Question: Are the necessary data available, accurate, and systematically collected to support evaluation activities?

Data quality and availability are essential for credible evaluation. This section examines whether data collection systems, reporting processes, and storage mechanisms are in place, and whether data are reliable, complete, and relevant to the evaluation questions.

| 5. Program Data | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) Data are currently collected on activities, including outputs and outcomes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Data quality is sufficient (reliable, valid, consistent). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Gaps in data collection can be filled with new tools or processes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Data governance (ownership, privacy, access) is clear. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Technical capacity exists for data management and analysis. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) Data collection tools are standardized across staff. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) Staff are trained in consistent data entry or collection. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) Baseline data can be collected before services begin. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i) Data systems can support an external evaluator's needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j) Periodic data audits or quality checks are conducted. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Average | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Program Evaluation Readiness

Key Question: Is the program prepared for evaluation, and is there clarity on whether a process, outcome, or impact evaluation is most appropriate?

Not all programs are ready for all types of evaluation. This section helps determine whether the program can support a basic process evaluation, a more advanced outcome evaluation, or an impact study, based on current design, data, and implementation maturity.

| 6. Program Evaluation | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Tier A: Process | | | | |
| a) Evaluation questions about implementation or fidelity are defined. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) The program is able to support a process evaluation (staff time, moderate resources). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Documentation exists to assess whether services are delivered as intended. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Stakeholders understand the purpose of process evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tier B: Outcomes | | | | |
| e) Short- and medium-term outcomes are defined. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) Indicators for outcomes can be measured reliably. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g) A comparison group, baseline, or benchmarking approach is feasible. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h) Follow-up data can be collected at appropriate intervals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i) Stakeholders intend to use outcome evaluation findings for improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tier C: Impact | | | | |
| j) The program's logic model supports establishing a counterfactual. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| k) The program's size, stability, and reach can support rigorous evaluation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| l) Resources (budget, expertise, time) are available for an impact study. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| m) The program is unlikely to undergo major changes during the evaluation window. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| n) Skilled evaluation partners are available or accessible | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Program Reporting and Use Readiness

Key Question: Does the organization have systems and capacity to analyze, report, and use evaluation findings for decision-making and improvement?

Evaluation is only valuable if findings are interpreted and applied. This section assesses whether the organization has staff, tools, and processes to synthesize results, communicate them effectively, and integrate lessons into program improvement and strategic planning.

| 7. Program Reporting and Use | Disagree | Slightly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| a) A reporting plan exists (or can be created) for sharing findings with stakeholders. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Stakeholders expect evaluation results and value learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Findings can be disseminated through appropriate channels (reports, dashboards, presentations). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) The organization has identified key decision points where findings will be used. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Staff and leadership are committed to acting on recommendations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f) The organization is willing to share both positive and mixed/negative results. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | | | | |
| Notes: | | | | |

Evaluability Assessment Results

Program/Project Name: Project Name

Date of Assessment: Month XX, 20XX

Completed By: Name Lastname

| Section | Score | Readiness Level | Recommended Action |
|--------------------------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Organizational Readiness | | | |
| Leadership Readiness | | | |
| Program Design Readiness | | | |
| Program Implementation | | | |
| Program Data Readiness | | | |
| Evaluation Readiness | | | |
| Reporting Readiness | | | |

Scoring Guide:

| Evaluation Type | Threshold | Ready? |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Process Evaluation | Most sections \geq 2.0 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Outcome Evaluation | Most sections \geq 2.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Impact Evaluation | Most sections \geq 3.5 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Recommendation:

- (1) Based on the section averages, the evaluation type best suited for this program is: [Process / Outcome / Impact Evaluation](#)
- (2) Key strengths include: [Insert content](#)
- (3) Areas for improvement before attempting higher-level evaluation: [Insert content](#)

Acknowledgements

This tool has been developed by Elite Research, LLC using the following sources:

- (1) BetterEvaluation. (2022). *Evaluability assessment template*. BetterEvaluation. <https://www.betterevaluation.org/>
- (2) Evaluation.gov. (2022). *Introducing the Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool*. U.S. Federal Evaluation Center. <https://www.evaluation.gov/>
- (3) United Way of Central Maryland. (2025). *Checklist for program readiness*.
- (4) National Scholarship Providers Association. (n.d.). *Assessing your organization's evaluation readiness*.
- (5) Office of Development Initiatives. (2013). *Evaluability assessment for impact evaluation: Guidance, checklists and decision support*. ODI.
- (6) Davidson, E. J. (2005). *Evaluation methodology basics: The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation*. Sage Publications.
- (7) Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- (8) Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

About Elite Research, LLC.

Elite Research, LLC is an Irving, Texas based market research, process optimization, evaluation, and statistical consulting firm. They are certified as a WBENC Women Business Enterprise (WBE), a Historically Underutilized Business (HUB), and an SBA Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB).



As a global provider of research and statistical consulting they provide expert support to academic researchers, government entities, nonprofits, researchers in the private sector and corporations in all facets of the research process, including the sampling, design, collection, analysis, reporting, implementation, and optimization of findings. Over thirty consultants and staff provide expertise in research design, programming, analysis, data management, survey development, sampling methodologies, web-based surveys, data collection plans, technical writing, and statistical analysis.

Phone. (972) 538 - 1374

Email. info@eliteresearch.com

Website. www.eliteresearch.com

Address. 9901 Valley Ranch Pkwy. E., Ste. 2035, Irving, TX 75063