**Evaluation Report Checklist**

|  |
| --- |
| **Checklist** **for** **Evaluation** **Reports** |
| Program/Project: |
| Agency: |
| Evaluator: |
| **1.** **The** **Report** **Structure** |
| **1.0** | **The** **Report** **is** **well** **structured,** **logical,** **clear** **and** **complete.** | [ ]  |
| 1.1 | 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). | [ ]  |
| 1.2 | The title page and opening pages provide key basic information: |  |
| [ ]  name of the evaluation | [ ]  |
| [ ]  timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report | [ ]  |
| [ ]  name of evaluator(s) | [ ]  |
| [ ]  name of the agency commissioning the evaluation | [ ]  |
| [ ]  table of contents which also lists tables, graphs, figures and appendices | [ ]  |
| [ ]  list of terminology including acronyms | [ ]  |
| 1.3 | The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes: |  |
|  | [ ]  overview of the evaluation | [ ]  |
| [ ]  evaluation objectives and intended audience | [ ]  |
| [ ]  evaluation methodology | [ ]  |
| [ ]  most important findings and conclusions | [ ]  |
| [ ]  main recommendations | [ ]  |
| 1.4 | Appendices increase the credibility of the evaluation report. Appendices may include: |  |
|  | [ ]  evaluation terms of reference | [ ]  |
|  | [ ]  list of persons interviewed and sites visited | [ ]  |
| [ ]  list of documents | [ ]  |
| [ ]  further information on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity | [ ]  |
| [ ]  evaluator’s justification of team composition | [ ]  |
| **2.** **Full** **description** **of** **Program** |
| **2.0** | **The** **report** **presents** **a** **clear** **and** **full** **description** **of** **the** **evaluated** **program.** | [ ]  |
| 2.1 | The inputs, outputs and results of the program are clearly described based on the Program Logic Map. | [ ]  |
| 2.2 | The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the evaluated program is described. | [ ]  |
| 2.3 | The scale and complexity of the evaluated program are clearly described.For example:[ ]  the number of components, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly or indirectly.[ ]  the geographic context and boundaries (such as the region, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant).[ ]  the purpose and goal, and organization/management of the program and its parts.[ ]  total resources from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) including Agency, State and Commonwealth funding. | [ ]  |
| 2.4 | The key stakeholders involved in the program, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles. | [ ]  |
| 2.5 | The report identifies the implementation status of the program, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies) that have occurred over time. In addition, explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation. | [ ]  |
| **3.** **Evaluation** **Purpose** **and** **Scope** |
| **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 and how the information will be used. | [ ]  |
| 3.2 | The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation’s ‘SMART’ results and scope including key evaluation questions. It should describe and justify what the evaluation did and did not cover. | [ ]  |
| **4.** **Evaluation** **Process** |
| **4.0** | **The** **report** **describes** **the** **evaluation** **process** **and** **clearly** **explains** **how** **the** **evaluation** **was** **designed** **to** **address** **the** **results** **criteria** **and** **answer** **the** **evaluation** **questions.** |  |
| 4.1 | The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Baseline data and benchmarks are included where relevant. | [ ]  |
| 4.2 | The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. It includes a discussion of how a mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy, validity and overcome data limitations. | [ ]  |
| 4.3 | The report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process during the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level of consultation. | [ ]  |
| **5.** **Findings** |
| **5.0** | **Findings** **relate** **directly** **to** **the** **results** **criteria.** | [ ]  |
| 5.1 | Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data. | [ ]  |
| 5.2 | Reported findings address the ‘SMART’ result criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and key questions defined in the evaluation scope. | [ ]  |
| 5.3 | Findings are objectively reported based on the evidence. | [ ]  |
| 5.4 | Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed. | [ ]  |
| 5.5 | Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence. | [ ]  |
| **6.** **Conclusions** |
| **6.0** | **Conclusions** **present** **reasonable** **judgments** **based** **on** **findings** **and** **substantiated** **by** **evidence.** |  |
| 6.1 | The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions. | [ ]  |
| 6.2 | The conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions to important problems or issues. | [ ]  |
| 6.3 | Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the program being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a variety of stakeholders. | [ ]  |
| **7.** **Recommendations** |
| **7.0** | **Recommendations** **are** **relevant** **to** **the** **program** **and** **the** **evaluation’s** **purpose,** **are** **supported** **by** **evidence** **and** **conclusions,** **and** **were** **developed** **with** **the** **involvement** **of** **relevant** **stakeholders.** | [ ]  |
| 7.1 | The report describes the process involved in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. | [ ]  |
| 7.2 | Recommendations are based on evidence and conclusions. | [ ]  |
| 7.3 | Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the agency. | [ ]  |
| 7.4 | An implementation plan for the recommendations is included within the report. | [ ]  |