

Review Checklist for Logic and Pathway Models

Program Name:	
Completed by (Name and Title):	Date:

Please check the appropriate box corresponding with either *yes*, *somewhat* or *no* for each line listed, and add any comments you may have. Reviewer feedback is crucial to the model revision process. Please write comments as needed to help explain your assessment and to offer further suggestions.

Logic Model

I. Overall Assessment: Logic Models should describe a program accurately, concisely, and coherently. They should reflect the internal logic of the program. Please review this program's Logic Model (LM) and Program Description, and offer overall comments. For example, does the LM match the Description? Is the LM clear? Does it tell a reasonable and coherent "story" (is the logic of this program plausible and internally consistent)? Are the elements of the LM consistent with the implicit program "boundary"? Other comments?

II. Section by Section Assessment:

Objective/Category	yes	some what	no	Comments
Inputs				
List of resources appears complete				
Descriptions are informative				
Gives reader accurate, at-a-glance idea of program size/scale (e.g., % FTE for staff; annual budget; avg # participants, etc. ... as appropriate)				
Activities				
List of activities appears complete				
Activity titles are clear and understandable				
Activity titles written in a general way (not context-specific)				
Activity list is consistent with program boundary (e.g. only includes activities that reach people who participate or who are targeted)				

Objective/Category	yes	some what	no	Comments
Outputs				
List of outputs appears complete				
Outputs are all tangible or measurable evidence of program activities (depending on program, this might include attendance list, certif. of completion, projects completed, hrs of participation or contact, etc.)				
Does <i>not</i> include effect on participants (outcomes)				
Outcomes in General				
Outcome titles are clear and informative				
Outcomes written in a general way (not context-specific)				
Outcomes are phrased as effects on, or changes in, participants and/or their communities or society (they are <i>not</i> actions, or objectives, or specific indicators)				
Short-term (ST) Outcomes				
List of ST outcomes appears complete				
Outcome is in the correct column (i.e., it logically arises with or “soon after” the activity and is <i>not</i> an output or mid-term outcome, etc.)				
Mid-term (MT) Outcomes				
List of MT outcomes appears complete				
Outcome is in the correct column (i.e., it plausibly arises beyond the ST, and reflects further outcomes for participants and/or spillover to others; is <i>not</i> a short-term or long-term outcome)				
Long-term (LT) Outcomes				
List of LT outcomes appears complete				
Outcome is in the correct column (i.e., it reflects ultimate impacts on participants and/or their communities/society at large)				

Objective/Category	yes	some what	no	Comments
Assumptions				
Clearly describes beliefs and thinking about the program and how it will occur				
List of assumptions appears complete				
Context				
Clearly describes environment (e.g., social, cultural, physical, etc.) in which the program is taking place				
List of contextual factors appears complete (captures relevant factors)				
Formatting				
Format is consistent				
Model is easy to read				

Pathway Model

Note to reviewers: there's no prescriptive level of detail or generality that's "right" under all circumstances. Some intended audiences may need more or less detail than others. As an outside reader, you can't be sure of the specific audience. However, the overall goal should be to ensure that a pathway model is comprehensive and internally consistent for some presumed audience. Please comment accordingly and raise questions for the program modeler if needed.

Objective/Category	yes	some what	no	Comments
Items				
All activities and outcomes from logic model are represented in pathway diagram				
Appropriate connections have been made to every item (no "orphaned" items)				
Connections				
All relevant connections appear to have been made				
Connections are made to nearer term outcomes whenever possible (no "leap-frogging" or redundancy)				
Big steps (as from a short to long term outcome) have been minimized				
Pathways				
Pathways clearly communicate the "story" or "program logic" that connects activities to long term outcomes				
"Dead ends" only appear as important side-effects or outputs				
Representation				
Pathway diagram efficiently communicates program logic				
Level of detail in both items and connections is not excessive – model is "readable"				

Overall Comments: