

BEST PRACTICE EVALUATION – a checklist

TO DO or NOT TO DO?

To what extent:

- Does it address rural health issues?
- Does it link into existing UDRH interests, priorities and strategic directions?
- Are the commissioners committed to a sound process?
- Do available resources match the expected output?
- Will it contribute to UDRH funds?
- Will it provide research quality outputs?
- Is it likely to lead to useful action and change?
- Will it build and nurture relationships and partnerships with stakeholders?
- Will it contribute to building skills and capacities?

YES

THE DESIGN PROCESS

- Evaluation built in from **beginning of the project**?
 - Commissioner and stakeholder **ownership** and involvement?
 - Project is **feasible** given:
 - o Required timelines?
 - o Available resources?
 - o Nature of program/project?
 - Evaluation **ethically sound** and approved?
 - Uses a **program logic approach**?
 - Uses an **action research/learning and refining** rather than a post facto audit approach?
 - Includes **process as well as output** evaluation?
 - Facilitation and **capacity building**
 - o For commissioner, practitioners, communities, clients and evaluators?
 - o Including:
 - Mentoring?
 - Training by involvement?
 - Formal training and workshops
 - Likely to result in **useable outcomes**?
- Negotiation, clarity and agreement** around:
 - o **Expectations** of process and outcomes
 - Types and focus/aim of evaluation?
 - Program goals?
 - Key performance indicators?
 - o Respective **roles and responsibilities**?
 - o Available **resources**?
 - o **Access** to:
 - Data?
 - Program personnel?
 - o Design and methodology – rigor, methodological refinement?
 - o **Data and IP ownership**?
 - o **Deliverables and timelines**?
 - o **Governance**?
 - o **Academic freedom**?
 - o **Costs and payment** schedules?
 - o Outputs and dissemination:
 - **Freedom to report** including negative findings?
 - Who has access to findings?
 - **Publication rights and freedoms**?
 - Whether recommendations are required?
 - Key agreements formalised in a contract.
 - Risk audit/analysis** included?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- Grounded in a **sound theoretical and literature framework**?
- Indicators** are:
 - o **Valid**?
 - o **Appropriate**?
 - o **Measurable** / operationalisable?
- Sampling** methodology provides:
 - o Adequate **bias control**?
 - o Sufficient **generalisability**?
- Data**:
 - o **Collection load** is manageable?
 - o **Completeness** and integrity protected?
 - o **Ownership** clarified
- Methodological Rigour**:
 - o Systematic?
 - o Transparent?
- Analysis and reporting:
 - o Systematic and methodologically sound?
 - o Academic integrity safeguarded?

COMMUNICATION AND GOVERNANCE

- Regular communication** with key contacts?
- Interim or progress reporting**?
- Opportunity for subject feedback and validation of findings?
- Steering Committee** that:
 - o Is **representative**?
 - o Has **clear & agreed roles & responsibilities**?
 - o Is **active**?

OUTPUTS

- Research Quality**?
- Final Report**:
 - o Agreement on **timelines**?
 - o Agreement on **audience(s) and format(s)**?
 - o Agreement on **writing responsibilities**?
 - o Mechanisms for handling disagreements?
 - o Agreement on recommendations?
- Academic Papers**:
 - o Publishable quality outputs?
 - o Agreements on IP, data ownership and publication rights?
 - o Agreement on authorship?
- Training**: Mentoring, workshops and seminars?
- Wider dissemination**
 - o Popular and electronic media
 - o Newsletter and community forums