Australian Government

Productivity Commission

A progression pathway for the Indigenous Evaluation Strategy

The Productivity Commission has developed a progression pathway for the Indigenous Evaluation Strategy (the Strategy).

The progression pathway is a tool to assist agencies plan a pathway to better evaluation of policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It provides a basis for agencies to assess their current practices and to identify where they can make improvements. The progression pathway will also help assess agencies' performance implementing the Strategy.

The pathway should be read in conjunction with the *Indigenous Evaluation Strategy: Background Paper* and the *Guide to Evaluation under the Indigenous Evaluation Strategy*. These documents provide guidance to agencies about how they can improve their evaluation practices to implement the Strategy more effectively.

Centring Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, perspectives, priorities and knowledges

	Unsatisfactory practice	Developing practice	Mature practice	Leading practice
Determining what to evaluate	Agencies do not engage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in decisions about what policies and programs should be prioritised for evaluation	Agencies undertake some engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people about what policies and programs should be prioritised for evaluation	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are engaged to decide what policies and programs have the greatest impact on their lives and should be prioritised for evaluation	Evaluation priorities are consistently set by, or in partnership with, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
	Evaluations do not consider how agencies are working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to develop and deliver policies and programs	Evaluations give limited attention to how agencies are working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to develop and deliver policies and programs	Evaluations include an examination of how agencies are working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to develop and deliver policies and programs	Evaluations routinely examine how agencies are working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to develop and deliver policies and programs, and how this can be improved
Planning, designing and conducting evaluation	Agencies place little or no weight on the perspectives, priorities and knowledges of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities when undertaking evaluations	Agencies recognise the benefits of incorporating the perspectives, priorities and knowledges of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities into evaluations, and they make some effort to incorporate these into evaluations	Agencies draw on the perspectives, priorities and knowledges of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities when undertaking evaluations	Agencies actively seek and draw on the perspectives, priorities and knowledges of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities when undertaking evaluations
	Agencies do not consider the impacts of their mainstream policies and programs on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Agencies make some effort to consider and measure the impacts of their mainstream policies and programs on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Agencies routinely consider impacts of their mainstream policies and programs on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and evaluate those where the impact is considered significant	Agencies partner with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in regularly, systematically and transparently assessing the impact of their mainstream policies and programs on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and evaluate those where the impact is considered significant
	Agencies do not give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities the opportunity to decide how they want to be involved in evaluations	Agencies engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities on how they would like to be involved in evaluations	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities have the opportunity to decide how they want to be involved in evaluations	Agencies consistently empower Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities to decide how they would like to be involved in evaluations
	Agencies allow insufficient time and resources for meaningful engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people during evaluations	Agencies allocate some time and resources to facilitate engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people during evaluations	Agencies allocate sufficient time and resources for meaningful engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people during evaluations	Agencies allocate sufficient time and resources for extensive engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people during evaluations
	Evaluators lack key skills and experience working in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in evaluation	Evaluators identify, acknowledge and address gaps in their skills and experience in working in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in evaluation	Evaluators are Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people, or demonstrate significant skills, experience and understanding working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Evaluators are Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people, or demonstrate extensive skills and have a range of experiences working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people across different settings
	Decisions about data planning, collection and use are made without engaging with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Decisions about data planning, collection and use are made after engaging with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Decisions about data planning, collection and use are undertaken with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	Decisions about data planning, collection and use are led by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
	Agencies make no attempt to reflect the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, perspectives, priorities and experiences when designing and reporting evaluations	Agencies recognise and acknowledge the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, perspectives, priorities and experiences and make some effort to reflect this when designing and reporting evaluations	Agencies typically reflect the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, perspectives, priorities and experiences when designing and reporting evaluations	Agencies consistently and effectively reflect the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, perspectives, priorities and experiences when designing and reporting evaluations
Reporting evaluation findings	Agencies do not involve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when translating or interpreting evaluation findings	Agencies seek to test translations and interpretations of evaluation findings with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people where evaluation findings affect them	Agencies actively engage or partner with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in translating and interpreting evaluation findings that affect them	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people lead the translation of evaluation findings that affect them to ensure that they are meaningful, accessible and useful
	Evaluation reports do not contain information about how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were involved in the evaluation process	Evaluation reports contain basic information about how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were involved in the evaluation process	Evaluation reports describe in detail how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were involved in the evaluation process	Evaluation reports describe in detail how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were involved in the evaluation process, including by reporting on the outcomes of this engagement
	Agencies make no attempt to communicate evaluation findings back to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities that participated	Agencies make evaluation findings available to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities that participated	Agencies are proactive in sharing evaluation findings with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities that participated	Agencies routinely share evaluation findings with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities that participated, using a variety of culturally appropriate formats
Building evaluation culture and capability	Evaluation teams do not have the capability to incorporate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges into their evaluative thinking. Agencies do little to address gaps in the cultural capability of their staff	Evaluation teams recognise the importance of — and seek to deepen their capability to incorporate —Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges in their evaluative thinking. Agencies identify gaps in the cultural capability of their staff and seek to address these gaps	Evaluation teams have the capability to incorporate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges into their evaluative thinking. Agencies provide opportunities for staff to strengthen their cultural capability	Evaluation teams have the capability to incorporate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges into their evaluative thinking, and have extensive experience in doing so. Agencies provide opportunities for staff to strengthen and maintain their cultural capability, and share their capability with others
	Agencies do not consider how their evaluations can strengthen capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators, organisations and communities to plan, commission, conduct and use evaluations	Agencies are aware that evaluations are an opportunity to strengthen capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators, organisations and communities to plan, commission, conduct and use evaluations, and pursue opportunities to strengthen this capability as they arise	Agencies' evaluation processes strengthen capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators, organisations and communities to plan, commission, conduct and use evaluations. Agencies support actions to build a cohort of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators	Agencies proactively identify opportunities to strengthen capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators, organisations and communities to plan, commission, conduct and use evaluations, and implement these through their evaluation conduct. Agencies support actions to build a cohort of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander evaluators
	Agencies have no relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and make no attempt to build them	Agencies have some relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and pursue opportunities to build them when they arise	Agencies have strong and sustainable relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and evaluation processes strengthen these relationships	Agencies have strong and sustainable partnerships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and proactively identify opportunities to strengthen these relationships
	Agencies dismiss or ignore feedback from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations about their evaluation practices	Agencies are willing to consider feedback from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations about their evaluation practices	Agencies encourage feedback from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations about their evaluation practices, and incorporate lessons from this feedback into their future practices	Agencies have enduring processes in place to receive feedback from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations about their evaluation practices, and incorporate lessons from this feedback into their future practices

Building credible evaluation practices

	Unsatisfactory practice	Developing practice	Mature practice	Leading practice
Determining what to evaluate	• Agencies do not set evaluation priorities, or set priorities in an ad hoc manner	• Agencies' approach to priority setting incorporates some assessment of the importance of policies and programs to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, the impact of the policy or program, and its risk profile, strategic significance and budget	• Agencies set evaluation priorities systematically based on what is important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, the impact of the policy or program, and its risk profile, strategic significance and budget	Agencies consistently set evaluation priorities in a systematic way that reflects what is important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, the impact of the policy or program, and its risk profile, strategic significance and budget
Planning, designing and conducting evaluation	• Agencies do not give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people the opportunity to be engaged in the evaluation process	• Agencies provide Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with opportunities to be involved in the evaluation process	• Agencies consistently provide Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with opportunities to engage in all stages of the evaluation process. Parts of evaluations that relate to outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by default, feature co-design or partnership arrangements	• Agencies have enduring structures and/or processes in place to facilitate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander engagement in all stages of the evaluation process. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people lead evaluations of Indigenous-specific policies and programs. For evaluations of mainstream policies and programs, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people lead parts of evaluations that consider the impacts of these policies and programs on Indigenous people
	• Agencies make little or no attempt to build independence into how evaluations are designed and conducted. Evaluation is undertaken by program managers	• There is increasing awareness within agencies of the importance of independence in evaluation, and steps are taken to build independence into how evaluations are designed and conducted	• Agencies ensure that there is an appropriate level of independence in their evaluation planning and conduct. Decisions about who should undertake an evaluation are made after considering the purpose of the evaluation and the knowledge and skills needed to do the evaluation well	• Agencies have enduring structures and/or processes in place to ensure that evaluation is consistently planned and conducted in an independent manner. Decisions about who should undertake an evaluation are driven by a robust assessment of who is best placed to undertake the evaluation, based on the purpose of the evaluation and the knowledge and skills needed to do the evaluation well
	• Evaluation is under-resourced by agencies	• The resources agencies allocate to evaluation are insufficient, but some more recent evaluations have been better resourced (and agencies acknowledge that more resources are required to do evaluation well)	• The resources agencies allocate to evaluation are proportionate to the size and importance of the policy or program being evaluated	• Evaluation is consistently well-resourced by agencies, and resources are consistently and effectively allocated based on the size and importance of the policy or program being evaluated
	• Agencies do not adequately plan for evaluation and data collection during the policy or program design process	• There is some evidence that agencies are planning for evaluation and data collection during the policy or program design process	• Agencies plan for evaluation early, before policies and programs are implemented so that the right data can be collected to undertake rigorous analysis and measure the things that are important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Agencies have processes embedded to ensure that evaluations are planned for early, before policies and programs are implemented so that the right data can be collected to undertake rigorous analysis and measure the things that are important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Evaluation planning is documented and followed through on
	• Agencies select evaluation approaches and methods with little or no regard to evaluation questions being asked, data, time and resources	• Agencies consider evaluation questions, data, time and resources when deciding on approaches and methods to be used in evaluations	• Agencies employ appropriate approaches and methods, given the evaluation questions, data, time and resources	• Agencies deliberately and routinely tailor evaluation approaches and methods to ensure they are the most appropriate, given the evaluation questions, data, time and resources
	• Agencies give little regard to the quality of the data they use in evaluation or how they are collected	• Agencies take steps to ensure that the data used in evaluation are of good quality and collected in a culturally safe manner	• Data used for evaluation are of high quality and are collected in a culturally safe manner. Data can be disaggregated to reflect the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities	• Data used for evaluation are consistently of high quality and are collected in a culturally safe manner. Data are disaggregated to reflect the diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities, where appropriate
	• Agencies apply little or no quality assurance to evaluations	• Agencies apply quality assurance processes to high-priority evaluations. The value of quality assurance is understood	• Agencies routinely apply effective quality assurance processes to evaluations	• Agencies have processes in place to apply quality assurance to evaluations. Quality assurance processes are tailored to evaluations
Reporting evaluation findings	• Evaluation reports contain little or no commentary on the methods or data used, or on the limitations of the evaluation	• Evaluation reports contain some information on methods and data used, and acknowledge the limitations of the evaluation	• Evaluation methods, data and limitations are described in detail in evaluation reports	• Evaluation methods, data and limitations are described in detail in evaluation reports. Information on methods and data are shared (where appropriate) to encourage replicability
Building evaluation culture and capability	• Evaluation teams and staff have gaps in their cultural and technical capability that impact on their ability to deliver high-quality evaluations. Limited effort is made by agencies to address these gaps	• Agencies identify gaps in the cultural and technical capability of evaluation teams and staff and make effort to address these gaps	• Evaluation is undertaken by teams that have the cultural and technical capability and experience to deliver high-quality evaluation. Commissioners have the necessary skills to effectively commission — and assess the quality of — evaluations. Agencies provide opportunities for staff to improve their capability to plan, commission, conduct, report and use evaluations of policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Evaluation is undertaken by teams that have the cultural and technical capability and experience to deliver high-quality evaluation. Commissioners have the necessary skills to effectively commission — and assess the quality of — evaluations. Agencies provide opportunities for staff to improve, maintain and share their capability to plan, commission, conduct, report and use evaluations of policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

Improving evaluation usefulness

	Unsatisfactory practice	Developing practice	Mature practice	Leading practice
Determining what to evaluate	• Agencies make little effort to channel evaluation effort into areas where it will add the most value	• When determining what to evaluate, agencies consider which policies, programs and outcomes affect the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and where there are knowledge gaps about what works, why, for whom and in what circumstances	• Agencies direct evaluation effort to policies, programs and outcomes most relevant for improving the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and where there are knowledge gaps about what works, why, for whom and in what circumstances	• Agencies direct their greatest effort to evaluating the policies, programs and outcomes that matter most to the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (as determined by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people), and where there are the greatest knowledge gaps about what works, why, for whom and in what circumstances. Agencies have processes in place to promote continuous improvement for all policies and programs, even if they are not deemed to be a priority for evaluation
Planning, designing and conducting evaluation	• Agencies do not integrate evaluation into the policy and program design cycle, and little effort is made to ensure that evaluation findings will be available at key decision points	• Agencies consider how evaluation findings will be used when planning and designing evaluations	• Evaluation is embedded in the policy design and delivery cycle and agencies plan for evaluation early. Evaluations are planned and conducted with the intention that findings will be able to be used at key decision points and to inform decision making by governments and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities. Program logics are developed for all new policies and programs	• Evaluation is embedded in the policy design and delivery cycle and agencies plan for evaluation early. Evaluations are planned and conducted with the intention that findings will be able to be used at key decision points and used as a basis for decision making by governments and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities. Program logics are developed for all policies and programs
	• Evaluation questions are of little relevance for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Agencies consider what is important for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and other intended users of evaluation when determining evaluation questions	• Agencies ensure that evaluation questions reflect what is important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and other intended users of evaluation. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are partners in the development and validation of evaluation questions	• Agencies ensure that evaluation questions reflect what is important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and other intended users of evaluation. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people lead the setting of evaluation questions that affect them
	• Agencies do not consider the data priorities of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when collecting and using data for evaluation	• Agencies consider the data priorities of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when collecting and using data for evaluation	• Data collected and used for evaluation align with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander data priorities	• Agencies have processes in place to ensure that data collected and used for evaluation align with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander data priorities
Reporting evaluation findings	• Evaluation reports are written and communicated in ways that limit their value and usefulness to inform decision making	• Agencies invest effort in ensuring that evaluation reports are written and communicated clearly and in a way that is useful to evaluation users including policy makers, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and program providers	• Evaluation reports are written and communicated clearly and in ways that are useful to evaluation users, including policy makers, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and program providers	• Evaluation reports are clearly written and communicated in ways that are useful to evaluation users. Communication of evaluation findings is tailored to maximise usefulness to different audiences
	• Agencies do not attempt to situate or contextualise the findings from evaluations against the wider evidence base	• Agencies make some effort to situate or contextualise the findings from evaluations against the wider evidence base	• Agencies synthesise evaluation findings and/or use findings in meta-analysis to contextualise findings and provide broader insights	• Agencies consistently synthesise evaluation findings and/or use findings in meta-analysis to contextualise findings and provide broader insights. Syntheses and meta-analyses are published
Building evaluation culture and capability	• Agencies place little or no value on evaluative thinking, or view evaluation as an inconvenience or threat	• There is growing appreciation of the benefits of evaluation in agencies	• Agencies view evaluation as core business. Agencies understand the benefits of evaluation as well as how to ask questions that will inform decision making	• Agencies view evaluation as an essential element of effective policy making and stewardship. A sustained culture of evaluative thinking and continual improvement is embedded across all levels of agencies
	• Agencies seldom use evaluation findings to inform changes to policies and programs	• Agencies use evaluation findings as important inputs when making changes to policies and programs	• Agencies routinely incorporate the findings of evaluations into how policies and programs are designed and managed, and new policy development	• Agencies have processes in place to consistently incorporate the findings of evaluations into how policies and programs are designed and managed, and new policy development
	• Agencies make little or no effort to build their capability to use and respond to evaluation findings. Agencies dismiss or ignore recommendations from the Office of Indigenous Policy Evaluation (OIPE), the Indigenous Evaluation Council and other authoritative sources on how to make their evaluations more useful	• Agencies recognise the importance of building their capability to use and respond to evaluation findings, and take some steps to build this capability. Agencies see recommendations from the OIPE, the Indigenous Evaluation Council and other authoritative sources as opportunities to make their evaluations more useful	• Agencies build their capability to use and respond to evaluation findings. Agencies recognise recommendations from the OIPE, the Indigenous Evaluation Council and other authoritative sources as opportunities to make their evaluations more useful. Agencies respond to recommendations	• Agencies build, maintain and share their capability to use and respond to evaluation findings. Agencies recognise recommendations from the OIPE, the Indigenous Evaluation Council and other authoritative sources as opportunities to make their evaluations more useful. Agencies respond to recommendations, including clearly identifying the recommendations that will or will not be actioned and why
	• Agencies do not acknowledge that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities may need some support to use and implement evaluation findings.	• Agencies appreciate that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities may need some support to use and implement evaluation findings, and make some effort to provide this support	• Agencies support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities to use and implement evaluation findings	• Agencies consistently and significantly support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities to use and implement evaluation findings

Building ethical evaluation practices

	Unsatisfactory practice	Developing practice	Mature practice	Leading practice
Determining what to evaluate	• Agencies do not engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on identifying evaluation priorities, or engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a culturally unsafe manner	• Agencies are aware of the importance of following ethical practices when engaging with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on identifying evaluation priorities	• Agencies engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on identifying evaluation priorities in an ethical way	• Agencies have established processes that ensure that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are engaged on identifying evaluation priorities in an ethical way
Planning, designing and conducting evaluation	• Agencies make little or no effort to ensure that evaluation is conducted according to the values and ethics identified in established guidelines for research and evaluation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities	• The values and ethics identified in established guidelines for research and evaluation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities inform how agencies conduct evaluation	• Agencies conduct evaluation according to the values and ethics identified in established guidelines for research and evaluation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities	• Agencies have consistent processes in place to ensure evaluation is conducted according to the values and ethics identified in established guidelines for research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities
	• Agencies' evaluation plans allow little or no time for evaluators to meet ethical requirements	• Agencies' evaluation plans allow some time and resources for evaluators to meet ethical requirements	• Agencies' evaluation plans allow sufficient time and resources for evaluators to meet ethical requirements	• Agencies' evaluation plans consistently allow extensive time and resources for evaluators to meet ethical requirements
	• Agencies do not assess ethical risks as part of the evaluation process	• Agencies assess and document ethical risks as part of the evaluation process	• Agencies undertake a systematic, risk-based assessment of ethical risk as part of the evaluation process. Agencies identify, document and action processes to reduce or manage ethical risk. Formal ethical review is undertaken when assessed as necessary, and is done by an ethics committee with expertise in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Agencies engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in undertaking a systematic, risk-based and consistent assessment of ethical risk as part of their evaluation processes. Agencies identify, document and action processes to reduce or manage ethical risk. Formal ethical review is undertaken when assessed as necessary and is done by an ethics committee with expertise in research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
	• Agencies do not consider how collecting, storing and sharing data can be done in a way that benefits Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• When collecting, storing and sharing data, agencies consider how this can be done in ways that benefit and do not harm Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including by engaging with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on how these actions are undertaken	• Agencies collect, store and share data in ways that benefit and do not harm Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Agency data governance and management processes collect, store and share data in ways that benefit and do not harm Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people
Reporting evaluation findings	• Evaluation reports contain little or no information or documentation about how ethical conduct was followed	• Evaluation reports contain some information or documentation about how ethical conduct was followed	• Evaluation reports clearly document how ethical conduct was followed	• Evaluation reports clearly and comprehensively document how ethical conduct was followed. Lessons learned as part of upholding ethical conduct are shared in reports
	• Evaluation reports do not acknowledge the contributions of evaluation participants	• Evaluation reports acknowledge the contributions of evaluation participants	• Evaluation reports recognise and provide information on the contributions of evaluation participants	• Evaluation reports recognise and provide detailed information on the contributions of evaluation participants
	• Decisions on the ownership, management and communication of data are made without any engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Decisions on the ownership, management and communication of data and results are made after engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	• Ownership, management and communication of data and results is negotiated with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and processes are agreed to at an early stage	• Agencies have enduring processes in place to ensure that the ownership, management and communication of data and results is negotiated with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and processes are agreed to at an early stage
Building evaluation culture and capability	• There is little or no understanding within agencies about what is required to conduct evaluation ethically with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and/or few or no opportunities provided for staff to improve their capability to undertake evaluation ethically	• There is some understanding within agencies about how to conduct evaluation ethically with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and the importance of building the capability of staff to undertake evaluation ethically	• Agency staff understand what is required to uphold ethical practice when evaluating policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and agencies provide opportunities for staff to improve their capabilities to address ethical issues during evaluation	• There is a deep and widespread understanding within agencies about what is required to uphold ethical practice when evaluating policies and programs affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Agencies proactively provide opportunities for their staff to maintain, improve and share their capabilities to address ethical issues during evaluation

Improving evaluation transparency

	Unsatisfactory practice	Developing practice	Mature practice	Leading practice
Determining what to evaluate	• Agencies do not publish relevant evaluation planning documents, such as evaluation forward work plans, priority setting criteria, evaluation frameworks, strategies or policies	• Agencies publish some evaluation planning documents	• Agencies publish (in full) all significant evaluation planning documents	• Agencies publish (in full) all significant evaluation planning documents in a single, accessible location
Planning, designing and conducting evaluation	• There is no transparency about who will conduct evaluations or how they are selected	• There is transparency around who will conduct evaluations and there is some transparency around the processes and criteria through which evaluators are selected	• Evaluation teams are selected through an open and transparent process. Where evaluations are commissioned, the processes and criteria used to make tender decisions are transparent	• There is a sustained commitment to transparency around how evaluation teams are selected. Where evaluations are commissioned, the processes and criteria used to make tender decisions are consistently transparent
	• Agencies provide evaluation participants with insufficient information before seeking their consent to participate	• Agencies appreciate the importance of providing information to evaluation participants, and some information is provided to participants before seeking their consent to participate	• Agencies provide evaluation participants with sufficient information about the purpose and conduct of evaluations, what participating means for them, the procedures for the collection and use of data, and other information before seeking their consent to participate	• Agencies provide evaluation participants with sufficient information about the purpose and conduct of evaluations, what participating means for them, the procedures for the collection and use of data, and other information before seeking their consent to participate
	• Evaluators do not engage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when determining how evaluation findings and data will be shared	• Agencies have some engagement with — and consider feedback from — Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people when determining how evaluation findings and data will be shared	• Agencies and evaluators work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people early in the planning process to determine how evaluation findings and data will be shared in ways that suit the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities	• Agencies and evaluators consistently work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people early in the planning process, and develop and follow plans (agreed to with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people) concerning how evaluation findings and data will be shared in ways that suit the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, organisations and communities
	• Agencies make little or no effort to facilitate appropriate access to and release of data, or do so in an inappropriate or culturally unsafe manner	• Agencies appreciate the importance of facilitating appropriate access to and release of data (including for peer review, participants and communities) while also protecting privacy and confidentiality, and make efforts to accommodate this through their evaluation practices	• Agencies facilitate access to and release of data (including for peer review, participants and communities) while also protecting privacy and confidentiality	• Agencies have clear, robust and proven processes in place for facilitating access to and release of data (including for peer review, participants and communities) while also protecting privacy and confidentiality. Agencies have a proven record of appropriately providing access to and release of data
Reporting evaluation findings	• Reports of evaluations of policies and programs that affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are not published	• Most reports of evaluations of policies and programs that affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are published and shared with the Indigenous Evaluation Clearinghouse	• The reports of evaluations of policies and programs that affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are routinely published, are easy to find and are shared with the Indigenous Evaluation Clearinghouse. Where evaluation reports are not published, reasons are provided, and a summary of the report published	• The reports of evaluations of policies and programs that affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are published, are easy to find and are shared with the Indigenous Evaluation Clearinghouse by default. Where valid reasons exist that justify an evaluation report not being published, these reasons are clearly articulated and published, and a summary of the report published
	• Evaluation reports contain little or no commentary on the methods or data used, or on the limitations of the evaluation	• Evaluation reports contain some information on methods and data used, and acknowledge the limitations of the evaluation	• Evaluation reports include clear documentation of methods, data, ethical practices and limitations of the evaluation and its results. Evaluation reports outline how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were engaged during the evaluation process	• Evaluation reports include clear and detailed documentation of methods, data, ethical practices and limitations of the evaluation and its results. Evaluation reports outline how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were engaged during the evaluation process. Information on methods and data are shared (where appropriate) to encourage replicability
	• Evaluation findings are not published and/or not supported by evidence. Agency management does not publicly respond to evaluation findings	• There is some discussion of findings and their basis in evaluation reports. Agency management provides some degree of public response to evaluation findings	• Findings are published in evaluation reports and their basis is transparent, clearly argued and well supported by evidence. Agency management publish a timely response to evaluation findings	• Findings are published in evaluation reports and their basis is transparent, clearly argued and well supported by evidence. Agency management publish a timely response to evaluation findings. The implementation of agency management responses is followed up and reported on
Building evaluation culture and capability	• Agencies make little effort to share lessons from their evaluations	• Agencies share lessons from their evaluations internally	• Agencies routinely share lessons from their evaluations internally, across other government agencies and with others external to government	• Agencies routinely share lessons from their evaluations internally, across other government agencies and with others external to government. Formal processes are in place to facilitate the recording and sharing of lessons
	• Agencies make no effort to keep evaluation participants informed of progress	• Agencies make information on evaluation progress available to participants	• Agencies make information on evaluation progress available to participants. Where evaluation activities have not commenced or been completed on schedule, agencies explain why and provide revised plans	• Agencies proactively provide information on evaluation progress to participants. Where evaluation activities have not commenced or been completed on schedule, agencies explain why and provide revised plans