

EIR Best Report Evaluation
DUE: August 31, 2021 to basommer@ucdavis.edu

Reviewer's name:

Report County:

REPORT QUALITY – Rate using the following scale:

very much			moderately			somewhat			slightly			not at all
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1			0		

1. Summary addresses the main issues, findings, and recommendations.	
2. Report identifies and addresses a significant issue.	
3. Selection of topic is explained in the Background section. The purpose of the investigation is clear (what was investigated and why). General information puts the study into context.	
4. Methodology section describes the investigative techniques used. The description is clear and quantified, while not revealing the identity of witnesses.	
5. Discussion section lays out the facts in a logical order.	
6. Discussion section avoids vague quantifiers and “wiggle language.” No unsupported or incomplete statements. None are inconsistent.	
7. Findings – each finding is based on and follows logically from the verified facts gathered during the investigation.	
8. Each finding is a conclusion (rather than a value judgment).	
9. All problems identified in the findings are accompanied by suggested means for resolution (Recommendations).	
10. Each Recommendation is reasonable, fiscally doable, and proportionate to the problem.	
11. Each recommendation states who should do what by when .	
12. The correct respondents are identified. Time for response is indicated. It is clear whether the response is required or invited.	
13. The tone of the report is objective and fair .	
14. The report is clear and understandable , such that each statement makes sense to everyone reading the report, even if they have little background in the subject.	
15. All statements are direct, specific and accurate – and quantified, if possible.	

Continued

EIR Best Report Evaluation
DUE: August 31, 2021 to basommer@ucdavis.edu

IMPACT OF THE REPORT – Rate using the following scale:

very much		moderately		somewhat		slightly		not at all
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

16. The report had an impact on the citizens in the community.	
17. The investigation was a difficult one, e.g., many agencies, bureaucratic interference (e.g., denials, subpoenas), etc.	
18. The grand jury’s report (or the civil grand jury itself) was made public (media coverage).	
19. The agency or agencies involved acknowledged the validity of findings/recommendations.	
20. There was additional public acknowledgement/change in procedure (e.g., reassignment, resignation, establishment of oversight, changes in policy, etc.)	
TOTAL POINTS	

COMMENT: Is there anything extraordinary about this report that is not covered in any of the above criteria? Any other comments?