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**Checklist: Quality of Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation report contents** | **Report quality checklist:** |
| **Executive summary** | * contains a clear and representative executive summary of the report * summarises the main findings, conclusions, recommendations in a summary table * presents overall lessons learned   **NOTE**: The executive summary is the part of the evaluation report that will be read most often. That is why its high quality is very important! |
| **Context** | * describes the context of the development programme * assesses the influence of the context on programme performance |
| **Intervention logic** | * describes and assesses the intervention logic (e.g. in the form of a logical framework) or theory * describes and assesses the underlying assumptions and factors affecting the success of the programme * takes into account the evolution of the programme |
| **Sources of information** | * describes the sources of information (documents, interviews, other) used so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed, * explains the selection of case studies or any samples, * cross-validates the information sources * critically assesses the validity and reliability of the data |
| **Methodology** | * annexed to the report explains and justifies the evaluation methodology and its application, including techniques used for data collection and analysis * explains limitations and shortcomings, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method |
| **Analysis** | * presents clear analysis covering findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them. * makes explicit the assumptions that underlie the analysis. |
| **Answers to ToR evaluation questions** | * answers all the questions detailed in the TOR for the evaluation * covers the requested period of time, and the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the programme * if not, justifications are given |
| **Limitations** | * explains any limitations in process, methodology or data, and discusses validity and reliability * indicates any obstruction of a free and open evaluation process which may have influenced the findings * explains any discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation and products of the evaluation |
| **Differences of opinion** | * acknowledges possible unresolved differences of opinion within the evaluation team |
| **Stakeholders comments** | * reflects stakeholders’ comments on the report and acknowledges any substantive disagreements |