📄 Inclusivity and Transparency Checklist (for Political-LLM Evaluation)

Purpose:
This checklist ensures that all Political-LLM experiments and evaluations explicitly report inclusivity, demographic coverage, and transparency of design choices.
It is intended as a reproducible and auditable documentation template for responsible political-domain LLM research.

Section 1: Dataset and Representation

Item	Description	Example / Guidance
Dataset Name and Source	Identify dataset(s) used (e.g., ANES 2016, ESS 2020).	"ANES 2016: American National Election Studies survey."
Time Coverage	Report the year(s) and political context.	"2016 US election cycle (pre/post-election)."
Population Coverage	Describe demographic dimensions (e.g., gender, race, education, ideology).	"Balanced across gender and education; underrepresentation in low-income group noted."
Ideological Spectrum Representation	Report the ideological balance (e.g., liberal/conservative ratio).	"Approx. 48% liberal, 44% conservative, 8% moderate."
Language or Cultural Coverage	Note if data is multilingual or limited to one region/language.	"English-only; no multilingual representation."

Section 2 : Model and Prompt Transparency

Item	Description	Example / Guidance
Model Identity	Specify model(s) used, including open/closed status and size.	“GPT-3.5 (API), LLaMA-2-13B (open weights).”
Prompt Disclosure	Provide representative prompts and templates.	“Prompts follow Q/A structure reflecting survey items (Appendix A).”
Prompt Sensitivity Testing	Report whether performance was stable under prompt paraphrasing.	“Average variation ±2.5% across paraphrases.”
Seed Robustness	Indicate whether random seed affects results.	“Variance <1% across 3 random seeds.”
External Tools / Retrieval Sources	Disclose use of retrieval augmentation, external databases, or plugins.	“RAG setup uses Wikipedia snapshot (2022).”

Section 3 -- Fairness and Inclusivity Reporting

Item	Description	Example / Guidance
Subgroup Fairness Metrics	Report metrics (e.g., parity gap, calibration error) across demographics.	“Answer-rate parity gap ≤5% between ideological groups.”
Response Distribution Analysis	Provide breakdown of outputs across groups (e.g., ideology, gender).	“Conservatives underrepresented in simulation by 3%.”
Bias Mitigation Steps	Describe interventions (re-weighting, prompt balancing, data augmentation).	“Added ideological balance constraint during sampling.”
Human Expert Validation	Indicate whether domain experts reviewed samples for bias or validity.	“Political science PhD student annotated 200 samples.”

Section 4 -- Accountability and Documentation

Item	Description	Example / Guidance
Model Card or Report Link	Provide public documentation link.	"Available at: https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Political-LLM-4FFF/Evaluation_Tools/Inclusivity_and_Transparency_Checklist.pdf"
Code and Evaluation Script Access	Link to reproducible evaluation code.	"Released at: https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Political-LLM-4FFF/Evaluation_Tools/eval-scripts.py"
Ethical Use Statement	Declare intended use and misuse limitations.	"For research only; not for political campaigning or profiling."
Governance / Audit Readiness	State whether results are independently auditable.	"All raw outputs and metrics stored in open repository for verification."

Checklist References

- Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., ... & Gebru, T. (2019, January). Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency* (pp. 220-229).
- Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Vaughan, J. W., Wallach, H., Iii, H. D., & Crawford, K. (2021). Datasheets for datasets. Communications of the ACM, 64(12), 86-92.
- Responsible AI Progress Report -- Google AI (2025). Responsible AI Progress Report. February 2025. https://ai.google/static/documents/ai-responsibility-update-published-february-2025.pdf