

# A STANDARDS BASED CHECKLIST FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION AS SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Dorene F. Balmer, PhD, Jennifer A. Rama, MD, MEd, Deborah Simpson, PhD

CHECKLIST FOR WRITING   REVIEWING EVALUATION <sup>1</sup> ORIENTED MANUSCRIPTS & ABSTRACTS	YES	TYPICALLY FOUND IN:			
		I/B <sup>2</sup>	M	R	D/C <sup>A</sup>
<b>1. OVERALL:</b>					
1.1. Reports on a systematic process to determine merit, worth, value or significance <sup>3</sup> of an event, program, project, activity such as a curriculum					
1.2. Evaluation focus and purpose (aim/objectives) are clear					
1.3. Evaluation model/framework used as guide					
1.4. Logical flow from evaluation focus to methods, results and discussion					
<b>2. Accuracy<sup>4</sup></b>					
2.1. Evaluation methods are sufficiently described					
2.1.1. What methods were used to collect evaluation data?					
2.1.2. What methods were used to analyze the data?					
2.2. Program outcomes go beyond acceptability/reaction ('did they like it?')					
2.3. Evaluation findings (intended and unintended outcomes) were described					
2.4. Program theory (or change model) undergirds claim about HOW the program worked or WHY it worked					
<b>3. Feasibility</b>					
3.1. Context/program was well described so that others can determine relevance					
3.1.1. What did the program intend to accomplish (aims)?					
3.1.2. When/where did the program take place (setting, timeframe)?					
3.1.3. Who were the participants (trainees x level, specialty, N)?					
3.1.4. Was this evaluation describing an innovation in an intervention/curriculum? If yes learning objectives, activities and assessments were clearly described.					
3.2. Evaluation methods were realistic given typical constraints in GME					
3.3. Evaluation seemed sustainable versus a one-off, one-time effort					
<b>4. Integrity</b>					

<sup>1</sup> Balmer D, Riddle J, Simpson D.(Eds) [Program Evaluation Rip Out Series](https://meridian.allenpress.com/jgme/pages/ripouts). JGME. 2020;12(4) – 2021;13(2).  
<https://meridian.allenpress.com/jgme/pages/ripouts>

<sup>2</sup> JGME uses the term Background rather than Introduction with a separate section on Objective (often found in Introduction) and may use the term Discussion with an additional brief Conclusion section.

<sup>3</sup> American Evaluation Association. What is evaluation? Accessed August 23, 2021.  
<https://www.eval.org/Portals/0/What%20is%20evaluation%20Document.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Yarbrough DB, Shula LM, Hopson RK, Caruthers FA. The Program Evaluation Standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users (3rd. ed). 2010. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. <https://evaluationstandards.org/program/> Accessed January 14, 2022

## A STANDARDS BASED CHECKLIST FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION AS SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Dorene F. Balmer, PhD, Jennifer A. Rama, MD, MEd, Deborah Simpson, PhD

4.1. Evaluation data gave voice to multiple stakeholders (trainees, graduates, faculty, DIO, clinical staff, patients)					
4.2. Stakeholder perspectives drive evaluation metrics, data collection methods					
4.3. Evaluation stayed true to the evaluation purpose (not research or learner assessment)					
4.4. IRB external review is addressed					
<b>5. Utility</b>					
5.1. Evaluation addresses a local problem (if scholarship – problem reflects a pressing problem in medical education)					
5.2. Evaluation data (its scope, clarity, timeliness) informs decisions; implication of those decisions described					
5.3. Evaluators shared practical and transferable lessons learned that others can use (what worked, what did not)					