



Outline for RTI Evaluation Report

This document provides a recommended outline for preparing a report following an RTI Evaluation using the CLD methodology. It is intended simply as a guide for those undertaking this task, to ensure some sort of consistency in the reports. However, if there are specific findings or issues that require more attention, drafters should feel free to add new headings to reflect these. We have also proposed fonts for the different levels of headings that could be used although, once again, these should simply be treated as suggestions; those preparing these reports may want to use an entirely different, more fully typeset layout.

Title Page

The title page should at least include the title of the Report and its date, and may also include the author(s) or sponsor(s), logos and pictures. The font for the title of this document may be used for the title.

Acknowledgements

Where acknowledgements are required beyond just one author, an Acknowledgements section may be useful. This can also include references to copyright, ISBN, if any, and so on.

Table of Contents

If the headings used in this document are used for a report, it will be possible to generate a Table of Contents automatically if using Word. This provides readers with an overview of what is in the report and also allows them to jump to sections easily.

Acronyms

If a lot of acronyms are used in the report, it is better practice to provide a list of them at the beginning.

Foreword

Where an institution is behind the application of the methodology and the preparation of the report, someone from that institution, normally the Executive Director or Chair, may want to draft a Foreword, explaining what the exercise was about, who was involved and why they undertook it.

Executive Summary

For longer, more complex reports, an Executive Summary can provide quick access to the key information, such as how the methodology was applied and the key findings.

Introduction

This should explain the history of both the right to information generally and in the jurisdiction being covered (such as when the law was first adopted and when the law currently in force was adopted), as well as other key introductory points.

Methodology

This section should explain the methodology that was applied. It should be based on the standard RTI Evaluation methodology, with its seven different assessment tools, each of which should be described (see below). For each of the four key assessment area sections (see below), it should explain not only how they were assessed but also how scoring and grading works. It should also indicate how the public authorities which were assessed were selected.

Assessment Tools

The standard assessment tools are:

1. Desk-based Literature Review: Describe what was reviewed in more or less detail depending on whether you have a specific section on this.
2. Desk Review of Proactive Disclosure: Describe how this was done.
3. Desk Review of Appeal Decisions: Again, describe how this was done.
4. Key informant interviews: Describe who was interviewed and, where relevant, include an Annex setting out questions.
5. Self Assessments: Again, indicate who filled these out and include an Annex with the questionnaires.
6. Office Visits: Describe how these were conducted and what sorts of information was collected during them.
7. RTI Requests: Describe how this worked, how the subject of the requests was identified (i.e. the information which was asked for), how many requests went to each public authority, how the requesters were identified and other

relevant information about the way this process worked. If requests were divided between male and female requesters, this should also be noted.

Central Measures

Describe the assessment tools used for this area – normally a literature review, a desk review of appeal decisions, key informant interviews and self-assessments – and the way the scoring and grading works.

Selection of Public Authorities

This sub-section should describe how the different public authorities assessed during the exercise were selected (i.e. what the criteria for choosing them were and so on). It should also mention which authorities were ultimately selected.

Institutional Measures

Describe the assessment tools used for this area – normally a literature review, key informant interviews and self-assessments – and the way the scoring and grading works.

Proactive Disclosure

Describe the assessment tools used for this area – normally a literature review, a desk review of proactive disclosure, key informant interviews, visits to the public authorities, and self-assessments – and the way the scoring and grading works.

Reactive Disclosure

Describe the assessment tools used for this area – normally a literature review, the RTI testing methodology, key informant interviews and self-assessments – and the way the scoring and grading works.

Literature Review

Where the literature review was extensive and there were specific findings associated with it, the author(s) may wish to have a dedicated section on this. Otherwise, these findings may simply be integrated into the separate sections on the four main assessment areas below.

Central Measures

This section should describe the results from the evaluation of central measures, or the oversight body. For this section, as well as each of the three that follow, it would be useful to include a table setting out the main statistical results (drawn from the standard Excel sheet used to record the findings). However, this section, like the three that follow, should not focus only on the features that are used to generate the grading for the authority. Rather, all significant results relating to this issue that

were discovered using any of the various assessment tools should be covered in the report. The section should also include recommendations for reforming the system.

Institutional Measures

This section should describe the results from the evaluation of institutional measures, based on the different public authorities that were assessed. In this section, as in others, it would be useful to include a table setting out the main statistical results (drawn from the standard Excel sheet used to record the findings). The section should also include recommendations for reform, which should at least include general recommendations across the whole system and which may include specific recommendations directed at individual public authorities.

Proactive Disclosure

This section should describe the results from the evaluation of proactive disclosure by the different public authorities that were assessed. Here again, it would be useful to include a table setting out the main statistical results (drawn from the standard Excel sheet used to record the findings). The section should also include recommendations for reform, which should at least include general recommendations across the whole system and which may include specific recommendations directed at individual public authorities.

Reactive Disclosure

This section should describe the results from the evaluation of reactive disclosure by the different public authorities that were assessed. Here again, it would be useful to include a table setting out the main statistical results (drawn from the standard Excel sheet used to record the findings). The section should also include recommendations for reform, which should at least include general recommendations across the whole system but may also include specific recommendations directed at individual public authorities.

Conclusion

This final section of the report should summarise the main findings and conclusions of the assessment exercise, probably including some of the key recommendations which were included in the different sections of the report.