Draft quality assessment tool for UNDAF/UNSDCF Evaluation reports

UNEG/DCO

Country	
UNDAF/CF cycle evaluated (Y1-Y2)	
Assessment Entity	

Total Score = [(A+B+C+D+E+F+G+H)	=				
		[0-50[	**[50 - 60[**	**[60-80[**	**[80 – 100]**
Final assessment		**Poor**	**Satisfactory**	**Good**	**Very Good**
		Report not usable to inform new CF	Report usable with caution to inform new CF	Report can be used to inform new CF	Report can be used very confidently to inform new CF

DRAFT Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports	
This checklist is intended to help evaluation managers and evaluators to ensure the final product of the evaluation - evaluation report - meets the expected quality. It can also be shared as part of the TOR prior to the conduct of the evaluation or after the report is finalized to assess its quality.	
Evaluation Title:	
Commissioning Office:	

1. The Report Structure *(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)*		
1.0	Is the report's length not more than 60 pages (less the executive summary and annexes)?	
1.1	The report is well structured, logical, clear and complete.	
1.2	Report is logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations).	
1.3	The title and preliminary pages provide key basic information. 1. Name of the UNSDCF and it's timeframe 2. Date of the report (Month and year) 3. Locations (country, region, etc.) 4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators 5. Table of contents including lists of Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes 6. List of acronyms.	
1.4	The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of not more than 5 pages that includes[1]: 1. Overview of the UNSDCF 2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience 3. Evaluation methodology 4. Most important findings and conclusions 5. Main recommendations	

---

[1] Executive Summary: Critical elements are listed in <u>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</u> (UNEG/FN/Standards[2005]), page 18, Standard 4.2, Number 3.

1.5	Do Annexes include the following minimum documents : 1. TORs 2. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition 3. Final Inception report, 4. The comprehensive stakeholders' mapping 5. List of persons interviewed and sites visited. 6. Evaluation matrix 7. results framework 8. List of documents consulted 9. Data collection instruments	
(A)	**Max total score = 18; weight total score over 10** **Total score for "Report Structure": (A)= [(Sum scores)x5]/9**	**(A)**
2. Context of Evaluation *(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)*		
2.0	The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.	
2.1	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation[3], for example: • **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly. • **The geographic context and boundaries (**such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant • The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object • The **total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions.	
2.2	The **report presents key stakeholders involved** in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
(B)	**Max total score = 9; weight total score over 5** **Total scores for "Context of the evaluation" = (B)= [(Sum scores)x5]/9**	**(B)**

	3. **Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.** _(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)_	
3.0	The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained.	
3.1	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	
3.2	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria and final evaluation questions used by the evaluators[2].	
3.3	As appropriate, evaluation criteria and evaluation questions adequately address issues of gender and human rights.	
(C)	**Max total score = 12; weight total score over 5** **Total scores for "Purpose, objectives and scope" = (C)= [(Sum scores)x5]/12**	(C)
	4. **Evaluation Methodology** _(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)_	
4.0	The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.	
4.1	The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.	
4.2	The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.	
4.3	The report describes the comprehensive stakeholders mapping (sampling frame); a representative sample (programmatic, stakeholders, geographic); and purposive rationale for selection, and limitations of the sample.	

---

[2] The most commonly applied evaluation criteria are the following: the five OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Each evaluation may have a different focus (not all criteria are addressed in every evaluation). Each agency may wish to add an indicator in this instrument, in order to assess the extent to which each criterion is addressed in the evaluation.

4.4	The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	
4.5	The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.	
4.6	The methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	
4.7	The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools, etc.)	
(D)	**Max total score = 24; weight total score over 10** **Total scores for "Evaluation methodology" = (D)= [(Sum scores)x5]/12**	**(D)**

5. Findings
(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)

5.0	Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions as described in the methodology section of the report.	
5.1	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
5.2	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, coordination sustainability and progress towards impact) and questions defined in the evaluation scope.	
5.3	Findings are objectively reported based on analysis and evidence.	
5.4	The Theory of change analysis and diagram reconstruction indicating UN outputs3 to CF outcomes is clearly interpreted.	
5.5	Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.	
5.6	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible	
5.7	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.	

---

[3] UN outputs may include joint workplans outputs, joint programmes outputs; agencies country programmes outputs

(E)	**Max total score = 24; weight total score over 20** **Total scores for "Findings" = (E)= [(Sum scores)x5]/6**	(E)
6.	**Conclusions** *(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)*	
6.0	Conclusions are logically informed by the findings and well aligned to the evaluation criteria	
6.1	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments of the evaluators	
6.2	Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	
(F)	**Max total score = 9; weight total score over 20** **Total scores for "Conclusions" = (F)= [(Sum scores)x20]/9**	(F)
7.	**Recommendations** *(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)*	
7.0	Recommendations are clearly linked to conclusions	
7.1	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	
7.2	Recommendations are geared towards addressing the weaknesses identified in the conclusions.	
7.3	Recommendations are context relevant	
7.4	Recommendations clearly identify the target entities responsible for implementation.	
7.5	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.	
(G)	**Max total score = 18; weight total score over 20** **Total scores for "Recommendations" = (G)= [(Sum scores)x10]/9**	(G)
8.	**Gender and Human Rights** *(Assessment levels: 0 - Does not meet criteria; 1 - partially meets criteria; 2 - meets criteria; 3 - exceeds criteria)*	

8.0	The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach	
8.1	The report uses gender sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc.	
8.2	The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender and human rights responsive and appropriate for analyzing the gender equality and human rights issues identified in the scope.	
8.3	The report assesses if the design of the object was based on a sound gender analysis and human rights analysis and implementation for results was monitored through gender and human rights frameworks, as well as the actual results on gender equality and human rights.	
8.4	Reported findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons provide adequate information on gender and human rights aspects.	
(H)	**Max total score = 15; weight total score over 10** **Total scores for "Gender and Human Rights" = (H)= [(Sum scores)x2]/3**	(H)