|  |
| --- |
| **EMBEDDING EVALUATION INTO EVERYDAY PRACTICE: TEMPLATES TO SUPPORT BETTER PRACTICE EVALUATION ACROSS THE COMMONWEALTH**The [Commonwealth Evaluation Toolkit](https://evaluation.gov.au/toolkit/commonwealth-evaluation-toolkit) is designed to support people to determine fit for purpose approaches to evaluate, measure, assess and report on the performance of Commonwealth programs and activities.There are many evaluation templates, tools and resources used across the Commonwealth, and in other jurisdictions, that may assist at different stages of an evaluation. While the set of templates available here are in line with better practice, the application and use of any one tool, template or example for the evaluation of a specific program or activity is ultimately at the discretion of the manager responsible for the successful delivery of results.The templates can be used to document how you plan to conduct an evaluation, or to strengthen routine performance measurement approaches. They are organised around the three stages typically involved in an evaluative activity:* Planning and budgeting (steps 1, 2 & 3)
* Measuring and assessing (steps 4, 5 & 6)
* Reporting and being accountable (steps 7 & 8)

More information about the stages and steps involved in an evaluative activity is available on the "[How to evaluate](https://evaluation.gov.au/toolkit/how-evaluate)" page in the Toolkit. The [tools and additional resources](https://evaluation.gov.au/toolkit/templates-tools-and-resources) in the Toolkit also provide further guidance and examples on how to complete specific evaluative activities and tasks.[ REMEMBER TO DELETE THESE REFERENCE NOTES BEFORE FINALISING YOUR DOCUMENT ] |

|  |
| --- |
| **TEMPLATE 7: Data/Evaluation matrix****Template Overview:** A data/evaluation matrix is a tool for organising evaluation questions and sub-questions and developing plans for collecting the information needed to address those questions. This template offers a sample of what a data/evaluation matrix might include. A data/evaluation matrix should be fit for purpose for an evaluation. |
| **A comprehensive set of templates is available in the Commonwealth Evaluation Toolkit:** These [templates](https://evaluation.gov.au/toolkit/templates-tools-and-resources) can be used to help document how you plan to evaluate, measure, assess and report on the effectiveness, efficiency and/or appropriateness of government programs and activities. Use of these templates is NOT mandatory.* **Planning and budgeting**
	+ Template 1 | Theory of change (outcome mapping)
	+ Template 2 | Program logic
	+ Template 3 | Evaluation framework (program)
	+ Template 4 | Evaluation terms of reference
	+ Template 5 | Evaluation plan
	+ Template 6 | Identifying stakeholders and their roles in an evaluation
* **Measuring and assessing**
	+ Template 7 | Data evaluation matrix
	+ Template 8 | Data sharing agreement  (Sourced from ONDC: Data sharing agreement ONDC (datacommissioner.gov.au))
* **Reporting and being accountable**
	+ Template 9 | Evaluation report
	+ Template 10 | Evaluation action plan
	+ Template 11 | Evaluation closure report

 [ REMEMBER TO DELETE THESE REFERENCE NOTES BEFORE FINALISING YOUR DOCUMENT ] |

**TEMPLATE 7**

Data/Evaluation Matrix – [program name][[1]](#footnote-1)

| **Evaluation questions** | **Data: WHAT to collect? WHEN to collect it?** | **Data: WHERE is it? HOW to collect it? WHO is responsible? ARE permissions required?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation questions** [insert your key evaluationquestions and any sub-questions as appropriate inthis column] | **Indicators** | **Metrics** | **Context** | **Data Frequency** | **Who, where and how to source this data?** |
|  | What are you going to track?The concept that will help answer the question | How are you going to track it?How the concept will be measured | What will the indicators be compared to?For example:* specified target values
* baseline values
* a relevant benchmark or standard
* a comparison group of comparable non-participants
 | How often will the indicators be collected?For example:* Weekly
* Monthly
* Quarterly
* Annually
 | **Program management team** via program administrative data. This includes application forms, funding agreements, progress/completion reports, fees collected number of recipients etc.**Policy team** via program policy documents, media reports, etc. |
| **Evaluator** via program documentation and/or literature reviews in collaboration with program/policy teams**Evaluator** via internal or external surveys or interviews and comparative data in collaboration with program/policy teams, data professionals, linked datasets or others as required |
| 1. **Need and Design: How appropriate was the design of the intervention?**
 |
| * 1. **How appropriate was the Australian Government’s intervention?**
 | Nature, magnitude and distribution of the opportunity or market failure | * NA
 | * Baseline need
 |  | Program policy documents: original policy rationale | Desktop review: relevant literatureInterviews/surveys at time of evaluation |
| Alignment with Australian Government’s strategic policy objectives |  |
| Level of continuing need for intervention |  |
| Level of charging |  |
| * 1. **How well was the program designed?**
 | Benefits of selected approach over other possible approaches (e.g. service delivery model, grants, charging) | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | Program policy documents: original policy rationale, program logic, past reviews and evaluations, program guidelines, decision briefs | Desktop review: relevant literature, other programsInterviews/surveys at time of evaluation |
| Strength of evidence-based links between activities, outputs and intended outcomes |  |
| Alignment with other program targeting similar objectives and/or stakeholders |  |
| Design changes since inception |  |
| 1. **Efficiency: How well was the intervention administered and delivered?**
 |
| * 1. **What has the program delivered?**
 | Program-level outputs | * Examples only
* Number and value of applications received and approved
* Number and value of agreements executed
* Value of fees collected
* Amount and distribution of services provided
* Number and proportion of projects commenced and completed
* Number and reasons for agreement variations
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Routine program data; program status briefsPolicy program documents | Interviews at time of evaluation: policy team, program team |
| Project-level outputs | * Examples only
* Number and nature of trials / analysis activities conducted
* Number and nature of research papers released
* Number and nature of stakeholder engagement events
* Number and nature of stakeholder awareness activities
 | * Grant agreements
* Project reports
* Fee revenue
 |  | Routine program data, applications and milestone reports, supplier forms | Interviews at time of evaluation: program team |
| * 1. **How well did the program reach and engage with the intended participants**
 | Level of reach | * Examples only
* Number of enquiries / number of hits to relevant websites
* Number and rate of eligible/ineligible applications or service provision, and reasons for ineligibility
* Rate of over or under-subscription
* Number of participants provided a service
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Routine program data | - |
| Alignment with intended participants | * Number and characteristics of participants (e.g. by type, size, sector, location, cohort)
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Routine program dataPolicy and program delivery documents (policy rationale, program guidelines) | - |
| Quality of engagement | * Number and nature of clarifications sought/required
* Number and nature of feedback and complaints received
* Level of applicant and participant satisfaction
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Routine program dataCustomer survey data (if conducted) | Interviews and surveys at time of evaluation: program team, applicants, participants |
| * 1. **How efficiently was the program delivered?**
 | Efficiency of delivery | * Number and nature of clarifications sought/required
* Number and nature of feedback and complaints received
* Level of applicant and participant satisfaction
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Routine program dataCustomer survey data (if conducted) | Interviews and surveys at time of evaluation: program team, applicants, participants |
| * 1. **How appropriate and effective were the governance arrangements?**
 | Appropriateness of governance | * Documented rationale for program governance
* Consistency with best practice program and grant governance
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Program documents: standard operating procedures, decision briefs | Desktop review: best practice |
| Effectiveness of governance | * Clarity of roles and responsibilities
* Level of adherence to structures and processes
* Clarity and transparency of decision-making
* Position and levels of decision-makers
 |  |
| * 1. **How well were risks anticipated, mitigated and managed?**
 | Adequacy of risk planning | * Number and nature of significant risk events that emerged that had and had not been identified in the risk plan
 | * Expectations prior to launch
* Best practice risk planning and management
 |  | Program documents: risk plan, risk register, decision briefs | Desktop review: best practice risk planning and risk managementInterviews at time of evaluation: policy and program teams |
| Effectiveness of risk mitigation and management | * Number, nature and effectiveness of interventions to mitigate and manage significant risks
 |  |
| * 1. **How robust were performance assessment mechanisms?**
 | Appropriateness of performance framework | * Appropriateness of performance indicators
 |  |  | Policy documents: Evaluation Framework (data matrix) | Desktop review: best practice performance assessment Interviews at time of evaluation: policy and program teams |
| Completeness of data collection | * Proportion of KPIs for which data was collected
* Number, nature and significance of data gaps
 | * Expectations prior to launch
* Best practice performance assessment
 |  | Program data (routine and manually collected) |
| Use of data for decision-making | * Number and nature of instances where performance data informed decision-making
 |  | Program decision briefs |
| 1. **Effectiveness: How effective was the program? (Did it work?)**
 |
| * 1. **To what extent have the intended short-term outcomes occurred?**

(Note: the outcome questions will vary according to the program’s intended outcomes.) | [Suitable indicator] | * Metric 1
* Metric 2
* …
 | * [Expectations or other suitable comparator]
 |  | Policy documents: Initial policy rationale, program guidelinesProgram data: application, progress and final report  | Review and analysis of externally held data (ABS, other?)Surveys/interviews at time of evaluation: policy team and program participantsMedia reports (with caution)Previous program reviews, evaluations, or audits |
| * 1. **To what extent have the intended medium-term outcomes occurred?**
 | [Suitable indicator] | * Metric 1
* Metric 2
* …
 | * [Expectations or other suitable comparator]
 |  | Policy documents: Initial policy rationale, program guidelinesProgram data: application, progress and final reports | Review and analysis of externally held data (ABS, other?)Surveys/interviews at time of evaluation: policy team and program participantsMedia reports (with caution)Previous program reviews, evaluations, or audits |
| * 1. **To what extent have the intended long-term outcomes occurred?**

(Note: Only include those identified as within scope of the evaluation (check your program logic and theory of change) | [Suitable indicator] | * Metric 1
* Metric 2
* …
 | * [Expectations or other suitable comparator]
 |  | Policy documents: Initial policy rationale, program guidelinesProgram data: application, progress and final reports | Review and analysis of externally held data (ABS, other?)Surveys/interviews at time of evaluation: policy team and program participantsMedia reports (with caution)Previous program reviews, evaluations, or audits |
| * 1. **How have program benefits been distributed? Did any groups benefit more or less than others? Were any participants or groups negatively affected? If so, who and how?**
 | Distribution of benefits | * Variation in outcomes within and between different groups of participants (e.g. by size, location, sector, cohort)
* Number and type of participants negatively affected and nature of negative affects
 | * Expectations prior to launch
 |  | Program data | Review and analysis of documents and dataSurveys/interviews at time of evaluation: policy team and program participants, peak bodies (others?) |
| * 1. **What factors facilitated or limited the achievement of intended outcomes? How could they be leveraged or mitigated?**
 | NA | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | Policy documents Program logic (external factors) | Survey/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholders |
| * 1. **How durable or sustainable are the outcomes?**
 | NA | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | - | Survey/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholders |
| * 1. **Did the program have any unintended consequences (positive or negative)? What action (if any) was taken to mitigate unintended consequences and how effective was this?**
 | NA | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | Program documents: final project reports, decision briefs | Media reports (with caution)Surveys/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholdersOther data sources? |
| * 1. **What would have happened in the absence of the program**
 | [Counterfactual] | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | - | Survey/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholdersCounterfactual analysis as relevant |
| * 1. **To what extent did the program provide value for the investment made?**
 | EconomyEfficiencyEquityEffectivenessCost-effectiveness | * Program cost (inc admin costs)
* Ratio of inputs to outputs
* Distribution of access and benefits
* Extent to which outcomes were achieved
* Ratio of costs to outcomes achieved
 | * Expectations prior to launch
* Comparable programs
 |  | - | Comparable program analysisSurveys/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholdersOther data sources? |
| 1. **Lessons: What lessons were learned that could inform future (or revised) programs or activities?**
 |
| * 1. **What lessons have been learned that could improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this program and/or future programs?**
 | NA | * NA
 | * NA
 |  | Program documents: closure report, lessons learned register, final project reports | Surveys/interviews at time of evaluation: all stakeholders |

1. Template adapted from DISR Evaluation Unit - SAMPLE ONLY [↑](#footnote-ref-1)