



# UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports

Approved at the UNEG AGM 2010, this quality checklist for evaluation reports serves as a guideline for UNEG members in the preparation and assessment of an evaluation report.

Based on the UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation, this checklist includes critical indicators for a high-quality evaluation report.

## UNEG 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

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	<p>The title page and opening pages provide key basic information.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the evaluation object</li> <li>2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report</li> <li>3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object</li> <li>4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators</li> <li>5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation</li> <li>6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes</li> <li>7. List of acronyms.</li> </ol>	
1.3	<p>The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes<sup>1</sup>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overview of the evaluation object</li> <li>2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience</li> <li>3. Evaluation methodology</li> <li>4. Most important findings and conclusions</li> <li>5. Main recommendations</li> </ol>	

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

1.4	Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia: <sup>2</sup> 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	
<b>2. Object of Evaluation</b>		
2.0	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation <sup>3</sup> .	
2.1	The <b>logic model and/or the expected results chain</b> (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.	
2.2	The <b>context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors</b> 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.	
2.3	The scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The number of components</b>, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly and indirectly.</li> <li>• <b>The geographic context and boundaries</b> (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant</li> <li>• The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object</li> <li>• The <b>total resources</b> from all sources, including human resources and budget(s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner government and other donor contributions.</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup> Content of Annexes is described in [UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#) (UNEG/FN/Standards[2005]), page 20, Standard 4.9 and page 23, Standard 4.18.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

2.4	The <b>key stakeholders involved</b> in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles.	
2.5	The report identifies the <b>implementation status of the object</b> , including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.	
<b>3. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope.</b>		
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 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.	
3.3	The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators <sup>4</sup> .	
3.4	As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights.	
<b>4. Evaluation Methodology</b>		
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.	

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

4.3	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.	
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 analysing 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.)	
<b>5. Findings</b>		
5.0	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.	
5.1	Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.	
5.2	Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and 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	Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible	
5.6	Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence.	
<b>6. Conclusions</b>		
6.0	Conclusions present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	
6.1	The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments relating to key evaluation questions.	
6.2	Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	

6.3	Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users.	
6.4	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.	
<b>7. Recommendations</b>		
7.0	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.	
7.1	The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	
7.2	Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions.	
7.3	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation.	
7.4	Recommendations clearly identify the target group for each recommendation.	
7.5	Recommendations are clearly stated with priorities for action made clear.	
7.6	Recommendations are actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow-up.	
<b>8. Gender and Human Rights</b>		
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 equality 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 equality and human rights aspects.	