CIPP EVALUATION MODEL CHECKLIST

[Second Edition]

A tool for applying the *CIPP Model* to assess long-term enterprises

Intended for use by evaluators and evaluation clients/stakeholders

Daniel L. Stufflebeam

March 17, 2007

The CIPP Evaluation Model is a comprehensive framework for guiding evaluations of programs, projects, personnel, products, institutions, and systems. This checklist, patterned after the CIPP Model, is focused on program evaluations, particularly those aimed at effecting long-term, sustainable improvements.

The checklist especially reflects the eight-year evaluation (1994-2002), conducted by the Western Michigan University Evaluation Center, of Consuelo Foundation's values-based, self-help housing and community development program—named Ke Aka Ho'ona—for low income families in Hawaii (Stufflebeam, Gullickson, & Wingate, 2002). Also, it is generally consistent with a wide range of program evaluations conducted by The Evaluation Center in such areas as science and mathematics education, rural education, educational research and development, achievement testing, state systems of educational accountability, school improvement, professional development schools, transition to work, training and personnel development, welfare reform, nonprofit organization services, community development, community-based youth programs, community foundations, personnel evaluation systems, and technology.

Corresponding to the letters in the acronym CIPP, this model's core parts are context, input, process, and product evaluation. In general, these four parts of an evaluation respectively ask, What needs to be done? How should it be done? Is it being done? Did it succeed?

In this checklist, the "Did it succeed?" or product evaluation part is divided into impact, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability evaluations. Respectively, these four product evaluation subparts ask, Were the right beneficiaries reached? Were their needs met? Were the gains for the beneficiaries sustained? Did the processes that produced the gains prove transportable and adaptable for effective use in other settings?

This checklist is designed to help evaluators evaluate programs with relatively long-term goals. The checklist's first main function is to help evaluators generate timely evaluation reports that assist groups to plan, carry out, institutionalize, and/or disseminate effective services to targeted beneficiaries. The checklist's other main function is to help evaluators review and assess a program's history and issue a summative evaluation report on its merit, worth, probity, and significance, and the lessons learned.

This checklist has 10 components. The first—contractual agreements to guide the evaluation—is followed by the context, input, process, impact, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability evaluation components. The last 2 are metaevaluation and the final synthesis report. Contracting for the evaluation is done at the evaluation's outset, then updated as needed. The 7 CIPP components may be employed selectively and in different sequences and often simultaneously, depending on the needs of particular evaluations. Especially, evaluators should take into account any sound evaluation information the clients/stakeholders already have or can get from other sources. CIPP evaluations should complement rather than supplant other defensible evaluations of an entity. Metaevaluation (evaluation of an evaluation) is to be done throughout the evaluation process; evaluators also should encourage and cooperate with independent assessments of their work. At the end of the evaluation, evaluators are advised to give their attestation of the extent to which applicable professional standards were met. This checklist's final component provides concrete advice for compiling the final summative evaluation report, especially by drawing together the formative evaluation reports that were issued throughout the evaluation.
The concept of evaluation underlying the CIPP Model and this checklist is that evaluations should assess and report an entity's *merit* (i.e., its quality), *worth* (in meeting needs of targeted beneficiaries), *probity* (its integrity, honesty, and freedom from graft, fraud, and abuse), and *significance* (its importance beyond the entity's setting or time frame), and should also present *lessons learned*. Moreover, CIPP evaluations and applications of this checklist should meet the evaluation field's standards, including especially the Joint Committee (1994) *Program Evaluation Standards* of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy; the Government Accountability Office (2007) *Government Auditing Standards*; and the American Evaluation Association (2004) *Guiding Principles for Evaluators*. The model's main theme is that *evaluation's most important purpose is not to prove, but to improve.*

Timely communication of relevant evaluation findings to the client and right-to-know audiences is another key theme of this checklist. As needed, findings from the different evaluation components should be drawn together and reported periodically, typically once or twice a year. The general process, for each reporting occasion, calls for draft reports to be sent to intended primary users about 10 days prior to a feedback workshop.[1] At the workshop the evaluators should use visual aids, e.g., a PowerPoint presentation, to brief the client, staff, and other members of the audience. (It is often functional to provide the clients with a copy of the visual aids, so subsequently they can brief members of their boards or other stakeholder groups on the most recent evaluation findings.) Those present at the feedback workshop should be invited to raise questions, discuss the findings, and apply them as they choose. At the workshop's end, the evaluators should summarize the evaluation's planned next steps and future reports; arrange for needed assistance from the client group, especially in data collection; and ask whether any changes in the data collection and reporting plans and schedule would make future evaluation services more credible and useful. Following the feedback workshop, the evaluators should finalize the evaluation reports, revise the evaluation plan and schedule as appropriate, and transmit to the client and other designated recipients the finalized reports and any revised evaluation plans and schedule.

Beyond guiding the evaluator's work, the checklist gives advice for evaluation clients. For each of the 10 evaluation components, the checklist provides checkpoints on the left for evaluators and checkpoints on the right for evaluation clients.

The CIPP Model's background is summarized in the appendix. For more information about the CIPP Model, please consult the references and related checklists listed at the end of this checklist.

1. CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

CIPP evaluations should be grounded in explicit advance agreements with the client, and these should be updated as needed throughout the evaluation. (See Daniel Stufflebeam's *Evaluation Contracts Checklist at* www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists)

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities—Contracting***
☐ Develop a clear understanding of the evaluation job to be done.	☐ Clarify with the evaluator what is to be evaluated, for what purpose, according to what criteria, and for what audiences.
☐ Secure agreements needed to assure that the right information can be obtained.	☐ Clarify with the evaluator what information is essential to the evaluation and how the client group will facilitate its collection.
☐ Clarify for the client, in general, what quantitative and qualitative analyses will be needed to make a full assessment of the program.	☐ Reach agreements with the evaluator on what analyses will be most important in addressing the client group's questions.
☐ Clarify the nature, general contents, and approximate required timing of the final summative evaluation report.	☐ Assure that the planned final report will meet the needs of the evaluation's different audiences.
☐ Clarify the nature, general contents, and timing of interim, formative evaluation reports and reporting sessions.	☐ Assure that the evaluation's reporting plan and schedule are functionally responsive to the needs of the program.
☐ Reach agreements to protect the integrity of the reporting process.	☐ Assure that the reporting process will be legally, politically, and ethically viable.
☐ Clarify the needed channels for communication and assistance from the client and other stakeholders.	☐ Assure that the evaluation plan is consistent with the organization's protocol.
☐ Secure agreements on the evaluation's time line and who will carry out the evaluation responsibilities.	☐ Clarify for all concerned parties the evaluation roles and responsibilities of the client group.
☐ Secure agreements on the evaluation budget and payment amounts and dates.	☐ Assure that budgetary agreements are clear and functionally appropriate for the evaluation's success.
☐ Clearly define provisions for reviewing, controlling, amending, and/or canceling the evaluation.	☐ Assure that the evaluation will be reviewed periodically and, as needed and appropriate, subject to modification and termination.

2. CONTEXT EVALUATION

Context evaluation assesses needs, assets, and problems within a defined environment.

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities—Program Aims***
☐ Compile and assess background information on the intended beneficiaries' needs and assets from such sources as health records, school grades and test scores, funding proposals, and newspaper archives.	☐ Use the context evaluation findings in selecting and/or clarifying the intended beneficiaries.
☐ Interview program leaders to review and discuss their perspectives on beneficiaries' needs and to identify any problems (political or otherwise) the program will need to solve.	☐ Use the context evaluation findings in reviewing and revising, as appropriate, the program's goals to assure they properly target assessed needs.
☐ Interview other stakeholders to gain further insight into the needs and assets of intended beneficiaries and potential problems for the program.	☐ Use the context evaluation findings in assuring that the program is taking advantage of pertinent community and other assets.
☐ Assess program goals in light of beneficiaries' assessed needs and potentially useful assets.	☐ Use the context evaluation findings—throughout and at the program's end—to help assess the program's effectiveness and significance in meeting beneficiaries' assessed needs.
☐ Engage a data collection specialist[2] to monitor and record data on the program's environment, including related programs, area resources, area needs and problems, and political dynamics.	
☐ Request that program staff regularly make available to the evaluation team information they collect on the program's beneficiaries and environment.	
☐ Annually, or as appropriate, prepare and deliver to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders a draft context evaluation report providing an update on program-related needs, assets, and problems, along with an assessment of the program's goals and priorities.	
☐ Periodically, as appropriate, discuss context evaluation findings in feedback sessions presented to the client and designated audiences.	
☐ Finalize context evaluation reports and associated visual aids and provide them to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.[3]	

3. INPUT EVALUATION

Input evaluation assesses competing strategies and the work plans and budgets of the selected approach.

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities—Program Planning***
☐ Identify and investigate existing programs that could serve as a model for the contemplated program.	☐ Use the input evaluation findings to devise a program strategy that is scientifically, economically, socially, politically, and technologically defensible.
☐ Assess the program's proposed strategy for responsiveness to assessed needs and feasibility.	☐ Use the input evaluation findings to assure that the program's strategy is feasible for meeting the assessed needs of the targeted beneficiaries.
☐ Assess the program's budget for its sufficiency to fund the needed work.	☐ Use the input evaluation findings to support funding requests for the planned enterprise.
☐ Assess the program's strategy against pertinent research and development literature.	☐ Use the input evaluation findings to acquaint staff with issues pertaining to the successful implementation of the program.
☐ Assess the merit of the program's strategy compared with alternative strategies found in similar programs.	☐ Use the input evaluation findings for accountability purposes in reporting the rationale for the selected program strategy and the defensibility of the operational plan.
☐ Assess the program's work plan and schedule for sufficiency, feasibility, and political viability.	
☐ Compile a draft input evaluation report and send it to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	
☐ Discuss input evaluation findings in a feedback workshop.	
☐ Finalize the input evaluation report and associated visual aids and provide them to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	

4. PROCESS EVALUATION

Process evaluations monitor, document, and assess program activities.

Evaluator Activities	*Client/Stakeholder Activities—Managing and Documenting*
☐ Engage an evaluation team member to monitor, observe, maintain a photographic record of, and provide periodic progress reports on program implementation.	☐ Use the process evaluation findings to coordinate and strengthen staff activities. ☐ Use the process evaluation findings to strengthen the program design.
☐ In collaboration with the program's staff, maintain a record of program events, problems, costs, and allocations.	☐ Use the process evaluation findings to maintain a record of the program's progress.
☐ Periodically interview beneficiaries, program leaders, and staff to obtain their assessments of the program's progress.	☐ Use the process evaluation findings to help maintain a record of the program's costs.
☐ Maintain an up-to-date profile of the program. ☐ Periodically draft written reports on process evaluation findings and provide the draft reports to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	☐ Use the process evaluation findings to report on the program's progress to the program's financial sponsor, policy board, community members, other developers, etc.
☐ Present and discuss process evaluation findings in feedback workshops.	
☐ Finalize each process evaluation report (possibly incorporated into a larger report) and associated visual aids and provide them to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	

5. IMPACT EVALUATION

Impact evaluation assesses a program's reach to the target audience.

Evaluator Activities	*Client/Stakeholder Activities—Controlling Who Gets Served*
☐ Engage the program's staff and consultants and/or an evaluation team member to maintain a directory of persons and groups served; make notations on their needs and record program services they received.	☐ Use the impact evaluation findings to assure that the program is reaching intended beneficiaries. ☐ Use the impact evaluation findings to assess whether the program is reaching or did reach inappropriate beneficiaries.
☐ Assess and make a judgment of the extent to which the served individuals and groups are consistent with the program's intended beneficiaries.	☐ Use the impact evaluation findings to judge the extent to which the program is serving or did serve the right beneficiaries.
☐ Periodically interview area stakeholders, such as community leaders, employers, school and social programs personnel, clergy, police, judges, and homeowners, to learn their perspectives on how the program is influencing the community.	☐ Use the impact evaluation findings to judge the extent to which the program addressed or is addressing important community needs. ☐ Use the impact evaluation findings for accountability purposes regarding the program's success in reaching the intended beneficiaries.
☐ Include the obtained information and the evaluator's judgments in a periodically updated program profile.	
☐ Determine the extent to which the program reached an appropriate group of beneficiaries.	
☐ Assess the extent to which the program inappropriately provided services to a nontargeted group.	
☐ Draft an impact evaluation report (possibly incorporated into a larger report) and provide it to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	
☐ As appropriate, discuss impact evaluation findings in feedback sessions.	
☐ Report the impact evaluation findings to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	

6. EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION

Effectiveness evaluation documents and assesses the quality and significance of outcomes.

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities—Assessing/Reporting Outcomes***
☐ Interview key stakeholders, such as community leaders, beneficiaries, program leaders and staff, and other interested parties, to determine their assessments of the program's positive and negative outcomes.	☐ Use effectiveness evaluation findings to gauge the program's positive and negative effects on beneficiaries. ☐ As relevant, use the effectiveness evaluation findings to gauge the program's positive and negative effects on the community/pertinent environment.
☐ As feasible and appropriate, conduct in-depth case studies of selected beneficiaries.	☐ Use the effectiveness evaluation findings to sort out and judge important side effects.
☐ Engage an evaluation team member and program staff to supply documentation needed to identify and confirm the range, depth, quality, and significance of the program's effects on beneficiaries.	☐ Use the effectiveness evaluation findings to examine whether program plans and activities need to be changed.
☐ As appropriate, engage an evaluation team member to compile and assess information on the program's effects on the community.	☐ Use the effectiveness evaluation findings to prepare and issue program accountability reports.
☐ Engage a goal-free evaluator[4] to ascertain what the program actually did and to identify its full range of effects—positive and negative, intended and unintended.	☐ Use the effectiveness evaluation findings to make a bottom-line assessment of the program's success.
☐ Obtain information on the nature, cost, and success of similar programs conducted elsewhere and judge the subject program's effectiveness in contrast to the identified "critical competitors."	☐ Use needs assessment data (from the context evaluation findings), effectiveness evaluation findings, and contrasts with similar programs elsewhere to make a bottom-line assessment of the program's significance.
☐ Compile effectiveness evaluation findings in a draft report (that may be incorporated in a larger report) and present it to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	
☐ Discuss effectiveness evaluation findings in a feedback session.	
☐ Finalize the effectiveness evaluation report and present it to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	
☐ Incorporate the effectiveness evaluation findings in an updated program profile and ultimately in the final evaluation report.	

7. SUSTAINABILITY EVALUATION

Sustainability evaluation assesses the extent to which a program's contributions are institutionalized successfully and continued over time.

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities: Continuing Successful Practices***
☐ Interview program *leaders* and staff to identify their judgments about what program successes should be sustained.	☐ Use the sustainability evaluation findings to determine whether staff and beneficiaries favor program continuation.
☐ ☐ Interview program *beneficiaries* to identify their judgments about what program successes should and could be sustained.	☐ Use the sustainability findings to assess whether there is a continuing need/demand and compelling case for sustaining the program's services.
☐ Review the evaluation's data on program effectiveness, program costs, and beneficiary needs to judge what program activities should and can be sustained.	☐ Use the sustainability findings as warranted to set goals and plan for continuation activities.
	☐ Use the sustainability findings as warranted to help determine how best to assign authority and responsibility for program continuation.
☐ Interview *beneficiaries* to identify their understanding and assessment of the program's provisions for continuation.	☐ As appropriate, use the sustainability findings (along with other relevant information on the program) to help plan and budget continuation activities.
☐ Obtain and examine plans, budgets, staff assignments, and other relevant information to gauge the likelihood that the program will be sustained.	
☐ Periodically revisit the program to assess the extent to which its successes are being sustained.	
☐ Compile and report sustainability findings in the evaluation's progress and final reports.	
☐ In a feedback session, discuss sustainability findings plus the possible need for a follow-up study to assess long-term implementation and results.	
☐ Finalize the sustainability evaluation report and present it to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	

8. TRANSPORTABILITY EVALUATION

Transportability evaluation assesses the extent to which a program has (or could be) successfully adapted and applied elsewhere. (This is an optional component of a CIPP evaluation. It should be applied when the client or some other authorized party desires and arranges for such a study. Sometimes such a transportability evaluation is an apt subject for a doctoral dissertation.)

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities—Dissemination***
☐ Engage the program staff in identifying actual or potential adopters of the program by keeping a log of inquiries, visitors, and adaptations of the program.	☐ Use the transportability evaluation findings to assess the need for disseminating information on the program.
☐ If relevant, survey a representative sample of potential adopters. Ask them to (1) review a description of the program and a summary of evaluation findings; (2) judge the program's relevance to their situation; (3) judge the program's quality, significance, and replicability; and (4) report whether they are using or plan to adopt all or parts of the program.	☐ Use the transportability evaluation findings to help determine audiences for information on the program. ☐ Use the transportability evaluation findings to help determine what information about the program should be disseminated. ☐ Use the transportability evaluation findings to gauge how well the program worked elsewhere.
☐ Visit and assess adaptations of the program.	
☐ Compile and report transportability evaluation findings in draft reports.	
☐ Discuss transportability evaluation findings in a feedback session.	
☐ Finalize the transportability evaluation report and associated visual aids and present them to the client and agreed-upon stakeholders.	

9. METAEVALUATION[5]

Metaevaluation is an assessment of an evaluation, especially its adherence to pertinent standards of sound evaluation (See Stufflebeam, Daniel. *Program Evaluations Metaevaluation Checklist.* www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists)

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities–Judgment of the Evaluation***
☐ Reach agreement with the client that the evaluation will be guided and assessed against the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy and/or some other mutually agreeable set of evaluation standards or guiding principles.	☐ Review the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards and reach an agreement with the evaluators that these standards and/or other standards and/or guiding principles will be used to guide and judge the evaluation work. ☐ Consider contracting for an independent assessment of the evaluation.
☐ Encourage and support the client to obtain an independent assessment of the evaluation plan, process, and/or reports.	☐ Keep a file of information pertinent to judging the evaluation against the agreed-upon evaluation standards and/or guiding principles.
☐ Document the evaluation process and findings, so that the evaluation can be rigorously studied and evaluated.	☐ Supply information and otherwise assist all legitimate efforts to evaluate the evaluation as appropriate.
☐ Steadfastly apply the Joint Committee Standards and/or other set of agreed-upon standards or guiding principles to help assure that the evaluation will be sound and fully accountable.	☐ Raise questions about and take appropriate steps to assure that the evaluation adheres to the agreed-upon standards and/or other standards/guiding principles.
☐ Periodically use the metaevaluation findings to strengthen the evaluation as appropriate.	☐ Take into account metaevaluation results in deciding how best to apply the evaluation findings.
☐ Assess and provide written commentary on the extent to which the evaluation ultimately met each agreed-upon standard and/or guiding principle, and include the results in the final evaluation report's technical appendix.	☐ Consider appending a statement to the final evaluation report reacting to the evaluation, to the evaluators' attestation of the extent to which standards and/or guiding principles were met, to the results of any independent metaevaluation, and also documenting significant uses of the evaluation findings.

10. THE FINAL SYNTHESIS REPORT

Final synthesis reports pull together evaluation findings to inform the full range of audiences about what was attempted, done, and accomplished; what lessons were learned; and the bottom-line assessment of the program.

Evaluator Activities	***Client/Stakeholder Activities: Summing Up***
☐ Organize the report to meet the differential needs of different audiences, e.g., provide three reports in one, including program antecedents, program implementation, and program results.[6]	☐ Help assure that the planned report contents will appeal to and be usable by the full range of audiences.
☐ Continuing the example, in the *program antecedents* report include discrete sections on the organization that sponsored the program, the origin of the program being evaluated, and the program's environment.	☐ Help assure that the historical account presented in the *program antecedents* report is accurate, sufficiently brief, and of interest and use to at least some of the audiences for the overall report.
☐ In the *program implementation* report include sections that give detailed, factual accounts of how the main program components were planned, funded, staffed, and carried out such that groups interested in replicating the program could see how they might conduct the various program activities. These sections should be mainly descriptive and evaluative only to the extent of presenting pertinent cautions.	☐ Help assure that the account of program implementation is accurate and sufficiently detailed to help others understand and possibly apply the program's procedures (taking into account pertinent cautions).
☐ In the *program results* report include sections on the evaluation design, the evaluation findings (divided into *context, input, process, impact, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability*), and the evaluation conclusions (divided into *strengths, weaknesses, lessons learned, and bottom-line assessment of the program's merit, worth, probity, and significance*). Contrast the program's contributions with what was intended, what the beneficiaries needed, what the program cost, and how it compares with similar programs elsewhere.	☐ Use the *program results* report to take stock of what was accomplished; what failures and shortfalls occurred; the extent to which the program was fully ethical; how the effort compares with similar programs elsewhere; and what lessons should be heeded in future programs.
☐ At the end of each of the three reports, consider including photographs and graphic representations that help retell the report's particular accounts.	☐ Use the full report as a means of preserving institutional memory of the program and informing interested parties about the enterprise.
☐ Supplement the main report contents, throughout, with pertinent quotations; a prologue recounting how the evaluation was initiated; an epilogue identifying needed further program and evaluation efforts; an executive summary; acknowledgements; information about the evaluators; and technical appendices containing such items as interview protocols, questionnaires, feedback workshop agendas, data tables, and on-site evaluator's handbook of procedures.	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Evaluation Association 2003 Ethics Committee. (2004). *Guiding principles for evaluators.* Available from http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciples.asp

Controller General of the United States. (2002, January). *Government auditing standards* (2007). Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office: Author. Available from http://gao.gov/govaud/ybk01.htm

Guba, E. G., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1968). Evaluation: The process of stimulating, aiding, and abetting insightful action. In R. Ingle & W. Gephart (Eds.), *Problems in the training of educational researchers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). *The personnel evaluation standards*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shadish, W. R., Newman, D. L., Scheirer, M. A., & Wye, C. (1995). Guiding principles for evaluators. *New Directions for Program Evaluation, 66*.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1966). A depth study of the evaluation requirement. *Theory Into Practice*, *5*(3), 121-133.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1967, June). The use and abuse of evaluation in Title III. *Theory Into Practice 6,* 126-133.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1969). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making. In H. B. Walcott (Ed.), *Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior* (pp. 41-73). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and National Education Association.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1972). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *SRIS Quarterly, 5*(1).

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1973). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making. In B. R. Worthen & J. R. Sanders (Eds.*), Educational evaluation: Theory and practice*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1983). The CIPP model for program evaluation. In G. F. Madaus, M. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Evaluation models* (Chapter 7, pp. 117-141). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1985). Stufflebeam's improvement-oriented evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam & A. J. Shinkfield (Eds.), *Systematic evaluation* (Chapter 6, pp. 151-207). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997). *Strategies for institutionalizing evaluation: revisited*. Occasional Paper Series #18. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center. Available from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/pubs/ops/

Stufflebeam, D.L. (2000). The CIPP model for evaluation. In D.L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan, (Eds.), *Evaluation models* (2nd ed.). (Chapter 16). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). The metaevaluation imperative. *American Journal of Evaluation, 22*(2), 183-209.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, & T. Kellaghan, (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational evaluation* (Chapter 2). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). Institutionalizing evaluation in schools. In D. L. Stufflebeam, & T. Kellaghan, (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational evaluation* (Chapter 34). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. (1971). *Educational evaluation and decision making* (Chapters 3, 7, & 8). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Gullickson, A., & Wingate, L. (2002). *The spirit of Consuelo: An evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona.* Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center. Available from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/pubs/ecpub.htm#Evaluation%20Reports

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications.* (Chapter 19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Webster, W. J. (1988). Evaluation as an administrative function. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 569-601). White Plains, NY: Longman.

U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2007). *Government auditing standards*. Washington, DC: Author. Available from http://gao.gov/govaud/ybk01.htm

RELATED CHECKLISTS

(available at www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists)

Checklist for Negotiating an Agreement to Evaluate an Educational Program by Robert Stake

Checklist for Developing and Evaluating Evaluation Budgets by Jerry Horn

Evaluation Contracts Checklist by Daniel Stufflebeam

Evaluation Plans and Operations Checklist by Daniel Stufflebeam

Evaluation Values and Criteria Checklist by Daniel Stufflebeam

Feedback Workshop Checklist by Arlen Gullickson & Daniel Stufflebeam

Program Evaluations Metaevaluation Checklist (Based on *The Program Evaluation Standards*) by Daniel Stufflebeam

APPENDIX: BACKGROUND OF THE CIPP MODEL

This checklist represents a *fifth installment of the CIPP Model*. The model's first installment—actually before all 4 CIPP parts were introduced—was published more than 35 years ago (Stufflebeam, 1966) and stressed the need for process as well as product evaluations. The second installment—published a year later (Stufflebeam, 1967)—included context, input, process, and product evaluations and emphasized that goal-setting should be guided by context evaluation, including a needs assessment, and that program planning should be guided by input evaluation, including assessments of alternative program strategies. The third installment (Stufflebeam et al., 1971) set the 4 types of evaluation within a systems/improvement-oriented framework. The model's fourth installment (Stufflebeam, 1972) showed how the model could and should be used for summative as well as formative evaluation. The model's fifth installment—illustrated by this checklist—breaks out product evaluation into the above-noted four subparts in order to help assure and assess a program's long-term viability. See Stufflebeam (2003-a, -b); Stufflebeam, Gullickson, and Wingate (2002); and Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007).

Notes

[1] The feedback workshops referenced throughout the checklist are a systematic approach by which evaluators present, discuss, and examine findings with client groups. A checklist for planning feedback workshops can be found at www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/.

[2] Applications of the CIPP Model typically have included relatively low-cost evaluation team members who spend much time at the program site systematically observing and recording pertinent information. (Their costs are relatively low because they reside in the program's geographic area and/or are relatively junior members of the evaluation field, such as graduate research assistants.) Called Traveling Observers when program sites are dispersed or Resident Observers when program activities are all at one location, these evaluators help design and subsequently work from a specially constructed Traveling Observer's Handbook containing prescribed evaluation questions, procedures, forms, and reporting formats. Such handbooks are tailored to the needs of the particular evaluation. While the observers focus heavily on context and process evaluations, they may also collect and report information on program plans, costs, impacts, effectiveness, sustainability, and transportability. The use of such specialists enhances the feasibility of regularly and closely studying a program when it would be too costly for the lead evaluators or high-cost experts to be on site for extensive periods of time.

[3] Whereas each of the seven evaluation components includes a reporting function, findings from the different components are not necessarily presented in separate reports. Depending on the circumstances of a particular reporting occasion, availability of information from different evaluation components, and the needs and preferences of the audience, information across evaluation components may be combined in one or more composite reports. Especially, process, impact, and effectiveness information are often combined in a single report. The main point is to design and deliver evaluation findings so that the audience's needs are served effectively and efficiently.

[4] A goal-free evaluator is a contracted evaluator who, by agreement, is prevented from learning a program's goals and is charged to assess what the program is actually doing and achieving, irrespective of its aims. This technique is powerful for identifying side effects or unintended outcomes both positive and negative, also for describing what the program is actually doing, irrespective of its stated procedures.

[5] See the RELATED CHECKLISTS section on page 14 to identify a number of checklists designed to guide metaevaluations.

[6] Clearly, different audiences have different needs and interests regarding the range of information available from an evaluation. A report on a program's background, organizational setting, and geographic environment would be of considerable interest to an audience that had no previous contact with the program; this same information would be of much less interest to an audience that possesses detailed familiarity with such matters. Potential adopters of a program often would want detailed documentation on how the program was organized, designed, staffed, funded, and operated, but many other persons, with interest in the program, would not require such detailed information. Likely, all audiences for the program evaluation would want information on its outcomes and judgments of its value. In general, evaluators are advised to identify the different audiences for an evaluation; analyze their differential needs; and—accordingly—design, prepare, and deliver modularized reports. When presented with such a modularized report, the different audiences can turn directly to the module(s) that most interests them. Providing such easy access to the desired information is in the interest of increasing the evaluation's impacts.