

ANNEX 10: TAXUD QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Report -

According to the Commission evaluation standards the quality of evaluation must be assessed on the basis of the pre-established criteria through the evaluation process and the quality criteria must as a minimum relate to relevant scope, appropriate methods, reliable data, sound analysis, credible result, valuable conclusions and clarity of deliverables.

In compliance with the above, this document provides a Quality Assessment to be completed for all interim and retrospective evaluations in order to:

- give a structured feedback to the Evaluator on the draft report, and
- support and justify the approval of the final version of the report.

The assessment criteria included should be applied also with reference to the specific Terms of Reference for the evaluation to be assessed and specific agreements made between the evaluation Steering Group and the Evaluator during the execution of the contract.

Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Report -

XXXXXXXX

DG/Unit: [DG/Unit]
Official(s) managing the evaluation: [Name(s)]
Evaluator: [Company/name]

Assessment carried out by¹:

- Steering group
- Evaluation Function
- Other (please specify)

Date of assessment [DD/MM/YYYY]

¹ Multiple crosses possible

Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

1. RELEVANCE					
Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ² :					

2. APPROPRIATE DESIGN					
Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

3. RELIABLE DATA					
Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

² Check the guide on the scoring criteria at the back of the document.

Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

4. SOUND ANALYSIS					
Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

5. CREDIBLE FINDINGS					
Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

6. VALID CONCLUSIONS					
Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

7. HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS					
Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

8. CLARITY					
Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arguments for scoring ¹ :					

9. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT					
Is the overall quality of the report adequate? In particular:					
– Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?					
– Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?					
– Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?					
	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Scoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment ¹ :					

Guide on scoring the criteria

1. RELEVANCE

Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?

This criterion concerns how well the evaluation responds to the terms of references.

- The evaluation report deals with and responds to the evaluation questions
- A justification was provided if any evaluation questions wasn't answered
- The scope covers the requested periods of time, geographical areas, target groups, parts of budget, regulations, etc.
- Limitations in scope are discussed and justified
- Effects on other policies, programs, groups, areas etc. are considered
- Unintended effects are identified
- The evolution of the intervention is taken into account possible changes in the problems and needs compared to the situation at the start of the intervention have been addressed
- The evaluation broaden the scope or enlighten the approaches in the policy cycle
- The evaluation add value to existing policy knowledge
- Other

2. APPROPRIATE DESIGN

Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

This criterion concerns the analytical framework put in place for the evaluation and in some cases, because of unforeseen events, it may also relate to a subsequent reorientation of parts of the evaluation work with reference to the initial offer.

- The evaluation method chosen is coherent with evaluation needs and requests;
- The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned;
- Information sources and analysis tools are adequate for answering the evaluation questions;
- Judgement criteria to help answer the evaluation question were pre-defined;
- Weaknesses of the selected method are pointed out along with potential risks;
- Research design has been validated with experts or relevant stakeholders if appropriate (e.g. experts on related policies, specific evaluation know-how);
- Ethical issues are properly considered (confidentiality of sources of information, potential harms or difficulties of participation of stakeholders, etc.);
- Findings are reliable enough to be replicable
- Other

3. RELIABLE DATA

Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?

This criterion concerns the relevance and correctness of both primary and secondary data.

- Available information and sources are well identified
- Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed
- Existing monitoring systems were used
- Data and information are free from factual or logic errors; data gathered are correct and sufficient
- Data collection rationale is explained; and it is coherent with the design of the study
- The quality of existing or collected data was checked and ascertained
- The amount of qualitative information and quantitative data is balanced and appropriate for a valid and reliable analysis
- Tools and means used to collect and process data (e.g. surveys, case studies, expert groups, etc...) were: selected in relation to criteria specified in the inception phase; complete and suitable for answering the evaluative questions; adequately used as to guarantee the reliability and validity of results
- Tools and data collection limitations (missing coverage, non-participation or non-attendance of selected cases) are discussed and explained.
- Correcting measures have been taken to avoid any potential bias and/or their implications
- Other

4. SOUND ANALYSIS

Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?

This criterion refers to the correct interpretation of data and to the adequacy of the method applied.

- There is a clear, solid and coherent deductive analysis (e.g. controlled comparison, experimental research, inferential statistics, etc.)
- The analysis is well focussed on the most relevant cause/effect relations and influences underlying the program logic, and alternative explanations have been considered
- The analysis uses appropriate quantitative or qualitative techniques, suitable to the evaluation context
- Cross checking of findings has taken place. The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence
- Explanatory arguments are explicitly (or implicitly) presented
- The context (historical, socio-economic, etc.) is well taken into account in the analysis
- The report reflects an appropriate range of stakeholders consulted
- Inputs from important stakeholders are used in a balance way
- The limitations of the analysis and exceptions to general explanations or evidences were identified, discussed and transparently presented
- Other

5. CREDIBLE FINDINGS

Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?

This criterion concerns the coherence of the findings with the preceding analysis and data.

- Judgements are based on transparent criteria
- Findings are supported by evidence originating from sound analysis
- Generalisations or extrapolations, when made, are justified (e.g., through the sampling or selection of cases)
- Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowhow are explained
- Stakeholder opinions were considered and reflected when appropriate
- Main findings are replicable
- Limitations on validity are pointed out; trade-offs between internal and external validity are identified and discussed
- Results of the analysis reflect an acceptable compromise of the perceptions of stakeholders and those described by figures and facts observed and estimated
- Other

6. VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-bias and fully based on findings?

This criterion concerns the extent to which conclusions logically stem from findings and are based on impartial judgement.

- Conclusions are properly addressed to the evaluation questions and other information needs
- Conclusions are coherently and logically substantiated by evaluation findings
- There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidences presented
- Conclusions are interpreted in relation to the policy context
- Conclusions are free of personal or partisan considerations; potential influence of values and interests of the evaluation team in the research method and outcome are openly discussed
- Conclusions are orderly presented and related (categorised, ranked, priorities, sequence)
- Controversial issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner
- Other

7. HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?

This criterion concerns the soundness and realism of the recommendations

- Recommendations stem logically from conclusions
- Plausible options for improvements are identified
- Recommendations covers all relevant main conclusions
- They are realistic, impartial, and potentially useful
- Relations among recommendations are taken into account (e.g. priority ranking, sequencing, etc)
- Recommendations provide certain guidance for action planning
- Where feasible, cost of recommendations were estimated
- Other

8. CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced, and written in an understandable manner?

This criterion concerns to the clarity of the presentation and the appropriateness of the content of the evaluation.

- The content of the report describes the policy being evaluated, its context, the evaluation purposes, contextual limitations, methodology, findings, etc in a neat and well-structured manner
- The report is well structured and signposted to guide and facilitate reading
- Key messages are summarised and highlighted
- There is a clear presentational linked sequence among data, interpretation and conclusions
- The report includes a relevant and concise executive summary, which includes main conclusions and recommendations in a balance and impartial manner
- Specialised concepts were used only when necessary and were they clearly defined
- Tables, graphs, and similar presentational tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text
- The length of the report (excluded appendices) is proportionate (good balance of descriptive and analytical information)
- Detailed information and technical analysis are left for the appendix; information overload is avoided in the report
- The report provides a proper focus of truly relevant issues
- Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers; the evaluator show awareness of potentially different needs and interests
- Other

9. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORT

The overall assessment of the evaluation report is not a self-standing criterion. Instead it summarises key elements and consequences of the eight preceding criteria. Moreover, the overall assessment needs to consider the concerns of the potential users of each specific evaluation:

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions? (certain internal users);
- Are the findings and conclusions reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness? (most *internal and external users*)

Notwithstanding intrinsic weaknesses, is the information in the report -or parts of it- a useful input for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions? (*certain internal users*)