

## Introducing the Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool

The CNCS/SIF team and our evaluation technical assistance partner, JBS International, are pleased to share an impact evaluability assessment tool with the Social Innovation Fund intermediaries, subgrantees and their respective partners. This tool is meant to assist you in examining impact evaluation readiness, in order to meet Social Innovation Fund's evaluation program and evidence requirements.

As you know SIF is a tiered-evidence-based program and is committed to documenting and capturing the effectiveness of programs that are funded under the initiative. One of the goals of the evaluation program is to increase the number of sponsored interventions with moderate or strong levels of evidence of effectiveness in achieving the desired outcomes. Thus, the evaluation and evidence bar for SIF is high.

In order to successfully meet SIF's evaluation and evidence expectations, it is important for all SIF-funded interventions to be well-positioned to conduct rigorous evaluations. Each intervention is expected to provide an impact evaluation, conducted by a third party evaluator, within the 3 to 5 year timeframe of the SIF grant.

The tool's checklist addresses three areas of organizational, program, and evaluation readiness to conduct rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations. In each area, a series of items/considerations are listed for assessment. Responses other than "True" on the rating scale suggest areas for probing and where potential issues may arise in the course of planning and implementation of the evaluation. Although the list presented is not exhaustive, it covers the key elements that need to be in place before undertaking an impact evaluation. The list also presents an opportunity to identify areas for technical assistance and capacity building prior to engagement in impact evaluation.

SIF intermediaries can determine where items reflect something a program must have on entry, or something that can be developed through technical assistance during SIF. A related key consideration is the feasibility of achieving readiness on a particular area of concern and the feasibility of completing evaluation plan development and implementation within the timeline of the SIF grant. In each case, the intermediary should carefully assess both feasibility and timing, and preferably map out a timeline with clear milestones to ensure that expectations are met and the impact evaluation study is completed in accordance with the SIF grant timeline.

We would welcome your feedback on this tool. Please share your feedback with Lily Zandniapour ([lzandniapour@cns.gov](mailto:lzandniapour@cns.gov)) and Nicole Vicinanza ([nvicinanza@jbsinternational.com](mailto:nvicinanza@jbsinternational.com)) and feel free to reach out with any questions.

Thanks for all you do!

## Introducing the Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool

This checklist is a tool designed to help organizations assess and discuss a program's readiness to participate in a rigorous impact evaluation, particularly using a quasi-experimental or experimental design study to measure effectiveness. It can be used for assessment, planning, and communication purposes. Rigorous impact evaluations require resources, expertise and necessary conditions as well as thorough planning and execution. This checklist covers the range of necessary elements for conducting an impact study on programs of interest. The elements are covered in groups or sections. A program may not address all items or meet all requirements noted within a section, however missing items or lack of readiness on a number of dimensions may indicate potential areas for discussion, development, or technical assistance prior to engagement in a rigorous impact evaluation.

The focus areas covered in this checklist are organized into three broad content categories: Organization Readiness; Program Readiness; and Evaluation Readiness. Each category addresses key elements of readiness. Readiness in all three areas covered is important for successful planning and implementation of an impact evaluation.

**Organizational Readiness** addresses intentionality, commitment and prioritization at the organization level. Core to these are existing support for evaluation, capacity building (as needed), learning, and use of data for decision making within the organization, especially at the leadership level. Additionally, organizational readiness means existence and support for the infrastructure necessary to conduct related activities within the organization.

**Program Readiness** addresses elements that need to be in place at the program level for conducting rigorous impact evaluations. These cover several areas: existing support for evaluation and evidence building at the program and stakeholder level, operational readiness, program scale, maturity and stability.

**Evaluation Readiness** addresses three areas of focus that include a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.

---

### Sources for Evaluability Checklist:

*Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation*. Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center. Justice Research and Statistics Association. [www.jrsa.org/jjec](http://www.jrsa.org/jjec). May 2003.

*Evaluability Assessment: A Tool for Program Development In Corrections*. Patricia Van Voorhis, Professor. Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.131.362&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

Anon. 2011. "Using the Evaluability Assessment Tool. Guidance Note 11." ILO.

[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_165984.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165984.pdf)

### Sources for Proposed Evaluation Partners Checklist:

Modified from: Dunn, E. 2008. "Planning for Cost Effective Evaluation with Evaluability Assessment". USAID. [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PNADN200.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADN200.pdf)

**Organizational Readiness** (existing support for evaluation, capacity building [as needed], learning, use of data for decision making within the organization, especially at the leadership level, and existence of requisite infrastructure to support related activities.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>			
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Leadership Commitment</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is support for the evaluation and evaluation capacity building, as needed, at the leadership level (CEO and/or Board of Directors).			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership demonstrates commitment to evaluation and evidence-based or data-driven decision making.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership supports staff positions/activities that focus on evaluation, learning, and improvement.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization and its Board of Directors demonstrate interest in learning about the effectiveness of the program by rigorously evaluating program effectiveness.			
<b>Learning Environment</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The organization provides opportunities for and fosters a culture of information sharing, discussion, reflection, learning, and improvement in order to support informed decision-making and practice.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff makes decisions based on regular assessment and use of data, information, evidence and feedback. For example, if a program was evaluated in the past, information that came from the evaluation was utilized.			
<b>Resource Commitment</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership is willing and committed to devoting necessary resources (e.g. staff positions and time and financial or other non-financial resources) to the evaluation.			
<b>Tools and Systems</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are systems, structures, tools, and processes in place for data collection, storage, processing, analysis, and reporting.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are systems, structures, tools, and processes in place for information sharing, reflection, knowledge building, and evaluation use.			

**Additional Comments:**

**Program Readiness** (existing support for evaluation and evidence building at the program and stakeholder level, operational readiness, program scale, maturity and stability.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>				
	<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Theory of Change</b>				
There is a coherent, logical program theory. Strategies and activities are designed to address a clearly identified and defined problem or need. There is a logical connection between the program strategies and activities and the intended outcomes or desired changes. Goals and objectives are articulated and attainable with the available resources. (The program has a logic model.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program participation is clearly defined and distinguishable from nonparticipation. There is no ambiguity about who is in the program and who is not.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a shared understanding among program leadership and staff about the core elements of the program and the context in which the program operates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is agreement across the program leadership and staff as to what the expected program outcomes are.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Clear Time Frame for the Program</b>				
The intervention has a clearly defined timeframe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a reasonable and shared expectation around the timeframe for when observable/measurable outcomes in the short, intermediate or long term will occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Support for Evaluation and Evidence Building</b>				
The program leadership and staff have a learning agenda for the implementation and effectiveness of the program so as to inform the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is interest and support among stakeholders in advancing a program's level of evidence by conducting an impact evaluation. Stakeholders see the value of evaluation and have ideas about how the program could benefit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Program and stakeholders are likely to agree (or are open to discussion) on what levels of evidence should be currently targeted, including the need for the development of evaluations that are designed to limit threats to internal validity <sup>1</sup> and/or enhance external validity <sup>2</sup> to the greatest extent possible.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> **Definition of Internal Validity:** For a given design, the extent to which the observed difference in the average group outcomes (usually program participants versus control or comparison group members) can be causally attributed to the intervention or program. Randomized controlled trials allow for high causal attribution because of their ability to rule out alternative explanations (usually unobserved characteristics) other than the intervention as the reason for the observed affect.

**Program Readiness** (existing support for evaluation and evidence building at the program and stakeholder level, operational readiness, program scale, maturity and stability.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>				
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Program Implementation</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
There are systems in place to track program implementation:				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Program Maturity and Stability</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<sup>2</sup> **Definition of External Validity:** The extent to which evaluation results, statistically, are applicable to groups other than those in the research. More technically, it refers to how well the results obtained from analyzing a sample of study participants from a population can be generalized to that population. The strongest basis for applying results obtained from a sample to a population is when the sample is randomly selected from that population. Otherwise, this generalization must be made on extra-statistical ground – that is, on a non- statistical basis.



**Program Readiness** (existing support for evaluation and evidence building at the program and stakeholder level, operational readiness, program scale, maturity and stability.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>			
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Scale/participation numbers</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

partnerships) have been identified, and risk monitoring and mitigation processes have been proposed or are currently in place.

External/contextual influences and factors are accounted for and assessed as relatively stable. These forces (e.g. policy environment) are not expected to affect the program and its participants in a significantly different way over time.

**Scale/participation numbers**

The program's intentions for expanding or advancing the model/intervention are clearly planned out, and sufficiently resourced and feasible.

The program is being delivered at a scale that allows for reasonable impact measurement against a counterfactual/comparison group controlling for potential biasing factors, such as demographic characteristics of participants (i.e. there is adequate statistical power for a statistical analysis in accordance with evidence standards).

**Additional Comments on Program Readiness:**

**Evaluation Readiness** (Program has a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>				
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	
<b>Past Evidence/Evaluation Work</b>				
A process evaluation or implementation analysis has been (or is currently being) conducted to ensure that the program intervention is implemented as envisioned, reaching the expected target group, leading to expected results, and to assess program participation, engagement, satisfaction, quality, and efficiency. For example,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• The process evaluation showed (or shows) that the program is serving/reaching its target population.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• The process evaluation showed (or shows) that planned activities are implemented as intended; services are delivered in sufficient amount and quality.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• The process evaluation showed (or shows) that participants and other key stakeholders are satisfied with the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is agreement across the program and stakeholders as well as evaluation partner(s) as to what program outcomes are, and on what types of outcomes data should be collected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outcomes are relevant to the services and program’s objectives, and clearly expressed in the program’s logic model. Outcomes may be expressed as short-term, intermediate, or long-term objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Current outcome measures are relevant and valid indicators of progress toward program objectives. For example, pre- post data show evidence that program beneficiaries experience a change in attitude, awareness, knowledge, behavior or condition.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• The program selects its current outcome measures and targets in conjunction with external standards of effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outcomes are defined in quantifiable, measurable terms, and procedures for measuring outcomes have been implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance data (i.e., performance measures) are routinely collected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prior outcome evaluations have been conducted and there is supporting evidence that the program is producing the desired results for participants/beneficiaries, and there is a compelling case for allocating resources for conducting an impact evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a shared understanding regarding the existing evidence behind the intervention/model by program stakeholders and evaluation partner(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Evaluation Questions</b>				

**Evaluation Readiness** (Program has a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>			
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Program Evaluation Readiness</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the evaluation will involve contracting with an external and independent evaluator, the program must have the capacity to effectively contract with and monitor work of the external evaluators such that:			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Proposed Evaluation Partner(s)</b>			
The proposed evaluation partner has previous experience in the following sub-categories:			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation Readiness** (Program has a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>			
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is experienced with the collection and analysis of impact data from more than one time point (e.g. pre-post or time series), including management of data at the level of analysis anticipated for the evaluation (e.g. individual, group, multi-level).</li> <li>Has no conflicts of interest, if hired.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed evaluation partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is able to mobilize data collection and management teams in the regions where the study is to be conducted, with evaluators able to conduct interviews, administer surveys, and collect other forms of data.</li> <li>Is able to place a qualified researcher/evaluator in charge. This individual must be willing and able to work closely with the program evaluation team and provide informed input.</li> <li>Is able to provide qualified and experienced individuals to support the desired evaluation design.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed evaluation partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is willing to commit to a study that will most likely have multiple modes of data collection, at multiple time points.</li> <li>Is willing/able to respond to requirements, criteria and input from the program, the key program funding partner, and any funding evaluation partners (e.g. in the case of multi-site evaluations of initiatives).</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An appropriate or reasonable budget is available and allocated to the evaluation. The evaluation budget is adequate for the type of evaluation design envisioned and in line with expectations about the work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are agreements and capabilities across the program and stakeholders for developing a timeline for, and timely production of evaluation deliverables, and to publish, communicate, and/or disseminate deliverables/findings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Specific Evaluation Requirements/Logistics/Pre-Requisites</b>			
There is agreement and commitment from all necessary program staff and stakeholders regarding the collection and use of data that is needed for evaluation purposes, including data relating to participant/beneficiary satisfaction, outcomes and impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the program is going to rely on administrative/secondary data, access to such data is possible and the needed agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) can be secured.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If a randomized controlled trial is to be conducted, sites are on board with the approach and ready to work with evaluators to assign an eligible pool of potential participants into treatment and control groups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation Readiness** (Program has a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>				
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Human Subjects</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Evaluation Timeframe</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Comparison or Control Group</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Evaluation Readiness** (Program has a history of, and focus on, evaluation, as well as the resources, structure, capacity, scope, and size to engage in rigorous impact evaluation. In addition, the program has an evaluation partner/team in place that has the experience and skills necessary for this type of evaluation.)

<i>Indicate to what extent each statement is true.</i>			
<b>Not at all true</b>	<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>True</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If one evaluation design will not address key threats to internal validity, there is a way to construct a combined design where two or more separate study components combine to sufficiently reduce multiple threats to internal validity (e.g. History-, Time-, and Site-related factors are potential confounds, meaning they could be omitted factors that caused the results) and allow justifiable causal claims.

**Additional Comments:**

Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool is a product of the Office of Research & Evaluation at the Corporation for National and Community Service and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC BY NC ND) 4.0 International License.

Created by Lily Zandniapour, Ph.D. (CNCS, Office of Research and Evaluation) with special thanks to JBS International, Inc. for their support in the development of this tool.

Suggested Citation: Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Evaluation. (2014). Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool. (lead author, Lily Zandniapour, Ph.D.). Washington, DC: Author.