|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Quality Assessment Detail Report Checklist [DRAFT: March 2018]** | | | |
| *Scoring Sheet* | | | |
| **Code** | **Rubric for Assigning Rating for Each Criteria** | | **Value** |
| HS | Highly Satisfactory | All parameters were fully met and there were no shortcomings in the evaluation report | 6 |
| S | Satisfactory | All parameters were partially met with some shortcomings in the evaluation report | 5 |
| MS | Moderately Satisfactory | The parameters were partially met with some shortcomings in the evaluation report | 4 |
| MU | Moderately Unsatisfactory | More than one parameter was unmet with significant shortcomings in the evaluation report | 3 |
| U | Unsatisfactory | Most parameters were not met and there were major shortcomings in the evaluation report | 2 |
| HU | Highly Unsatisfactory | None of the parameters were met and there were severe shortcomings in the evaluation report | 1 |
| N/A | Not Applicable | Does not apply since the answer is not available | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Basic Information on the Evaluation** | | |
| *Basic Information* | | |
| Title of Evaluation Report: |  | |
| Type of Evaluation |  | |
| Commissioning unit: |  | |
| Philippine Development Plan Output/Outcome: |  | |
| Author/s of the evaluation report: (Name, Title, Email, Gender, Nationality) |  | |
| Evaluation budget proposed: |  | |
| Date of Completion: |  | |
| Number of pages (excluding annexes): |  | |
| *Review Information* | | |
| **Final quality assessment submission date and signature of the reviewer:** | |  |
| **Evaluation Manager approval date and signature:** | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of Quality Assessment Report** | |
| **Sections** | **Summary of comments** |
| **1.** **Evaluation Structure and Design:** *Do the terms of reference appropriately and clearly outline the purpose, objectives, criteria and key questions for the evaluation and give adequate time and resources?* |  |
| **2. Evaluation Report & Methodology:** *Are the evaluation reports objectives, criteria, methodology and data sources, fully described and are they appropriate given the subject being evaluated and the reasons for carrying out the study?* |  |
| **3. Evaluation Results, Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations:** *Does the report clearly and concisely outline and support its findings, conclusions and recommendations?* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TERMS OF REFERENCE SECTION RATING** | |  |
| **Terms of Reference (TOR) and Design** | |  |
| ***Rating*** | ***Comments / Suggestions for Improvement*** | |
| **1. Does the TOR clearly outline the focus for the evaluation in a logical and realistic manner?** | | |
|  |  | |
| **2. Does the TOR detail timescales and budgets for the evaluation?** | | |
|  |  | |
| **3. Does the TOR clearly outline the evaluation's planned approach?** | | |
|  |  | |
| **4. Is the proposed outline of the evaluation approach and methodology clearly detailed in the ToR?** | | |
|  |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REPORT AND METHODOLOGY SECTION RATING** | |  |
| **Report and Methodology** | | |
| ***Rating*** | ***Comments / Suggestions for Improvement*** | |
| 1. ***Structure*** | | |
| * 1. **Is the evaluation report well-balanced and structured?**   **The 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. **The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:**   2. Overview of the evaluation object   3. Evaluation objectives and intended audience   4. Evaluation methodology   5. Most important findings and conclusions   6. Main recommendations | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:**  1. TORs 2. List of persons interviewed and sites visited. 3. List of documents consulted 4. More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity 5. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition 6. Evaluation matrix 7. Results framework | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Evaluation object*** | | |
| * 1. **The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.**   *The “object” of the evaluation is the intervention (outcome, programme, project, group of projects, themes, soft assistance) that is (are) the focus of the evaluation and evaluation results presented in the report*. | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. T**he logic model and/or the expected results chain of the object is clearly described.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:**  1. **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly andindirectly. 2. **The geographic context and boundaries (**such as the region, country, and/or landscape) 3. The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object 4. The **total resources** from all sources | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners** | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Evaluation objective*** | | |
| * 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.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover.** | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Methodology*** | | |
| * 1. **Is the evaluation's methodological approach clearly outlined?**   *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.* | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Is the evaluation methodology adequate for scope of the evaluation?** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **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.)** | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Data Collection*** | | |
| * 1. **Are data collection methods and analysis clearly outlined?** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Is the data collection approach and analysis adequate for scope of the evaluation?** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Are any changes to the evaluation approach or limitations in implementation during the evaluation mission clearly outlined and explained?** | | |
|  |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS SECTION RATING** | |  |
| **Recommendations and Lessons Section** | | |
| ***Rating*** | ***Comments / Suggestions for Improvement*** | |
| 1. ***Findings*** | | |
| * 1. **Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the evidence** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Does the evaluation include an assessment of the projects M&E design, implementation and overall quality?** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Are all indicators in the logical framework / theory of change assessed individually, with final achievements noted?** | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Conclusions*** | | |
| * 1. **Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings**. | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **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.** | | |
|  |  | |
| 1. ***Recommendations*** | | |
| * 1. **Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.** | | |
|  |  | |
| * 1. **Are the recommendations clear, concise, realistic and actionable? Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.** | | |
|  |  | |
| **Lessons Learned** | | |
| What key lessons can be drawn from the report? | | |
|  | | |