QUALITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (QAF)
QUALITY ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR EVALUATION REPORTS
Draft issued by the IEP at its 6th meeting to inform its work in 2024 and to be reviewed in 2025
Evaluation Title:
Year of Report:
Name of Reviewer/s:
Date of Review:
Instructions:
1/ The following documents are needed before embarking on the QA, Fraft Report or Full Report with annexes, ToRs, Inception Report and any other critical documents;
2/ The report has multiple sections to be scored;
3/ Each section includes questions and sub-questions
4/ Please score each sub-question , question and section from 0 to 8 (with a range at each of four ratings) as per the table below , You start with the subquestions and score them individually, you give your comments in front of each subquestion and then based on your scores for the subquestions you give an overall score for the question always using the scale 0-8. Once you have scored all questions you give your overall score for the section. Your final overall score always from 0 to 8 should take into account the scores of the various sections. A score at leach level may represent full compliance (higher score at each level) or sufficient compliance with an important gap (lower compliance at the level). 0 = not applicable to this evaluation 1-2 = Unacceptable 3-4 = Fair 5-6 = Acceptable 7-8 = Good
5/ Who scores: Both Quality Assurance Focal Points (QAFP) designated for the evaluation should use the tool independently to come up with their individual scores

6/ What happens after scoring? Once both QAFPs have completed scoring, one of the QA FPs should combine both sets of scores onto one excel spreadsheet (maintaining the individual scores). A third column will automatically calculate the divergence between the two sets of scores and highlight where there is a divergence of >=2 . QAFPs discuss where the greatest divergences have occurred. The aim of these discussions is to better understand the rationale for eachothers scores (not necessarily to come to consensus or result in an agreed score). If a QAFP wants to change their score after discussions they can - this should be recorded in a separate column with an explanation about the change in score. Results of the QAF go to the panel for a decision as to how to categorise the findings of the assessment and begin to inform the IEP commentary.

Report Section	
Section1:	**Executive summary**
QUESTION 1.1	**CAN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY INFORM DECISION-MAKING?**
1.1.1	Is ithe ES clearly presented; can it serve as a standalone document?
1.1.2	Does it include all necessary elements (overview of the object of the evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, key recommendations)?
1.1.3	Is the executive summary reasonably concise?
1.1.4	The ES does NOT introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report?
	SECTION 1: Summary score & advice for improvement
Section 2	**Background**
QUESTION 2.1	**IS THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION CLEARLY DESCRIBED?**
2.1.1	Clear and relevant description of the object of evaluation, location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.
2.1.2	Clear and relevant description of intended stakeholders with responsibilities regarding the object of evaluation by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals…), by geographic location(s) (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation) and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).
	SECTION 2: Summary score & advice for improvement
Section 3	**Purposes, scope, and objectives**
QUESTION 3.1	**IS THE PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION CLEARLY DESCRIBED?**

3.1.1	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.
3.1.2	A sufficient description of the subject to be evaluated in the broader context of global development and other relevant projects/programs/donors is included.
QUESTION 3.2	**ARE THE OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION CLEAR AND REALISTIC?**
3.2.1	Clear and complete description of evaluation questions and subquestions with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).
3.2.2	Any departures from the inception report are clearly described and justified. (What are the key assumptions and risks identified?)
QUESTION 3.3	**IS THE THEORY OF CHANGE, RESULTS CHAIN, OR LOGIC WELL-ARTICULATED?**
3.3.1	Clear description of the object of the evaluation's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.
3.3.2	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).
3.3.3	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.
	SECTION 3: Summary score & advice for improvement
Section 4	**Methodology**
QUESTION 4.1	**DOES THE REPORT SPECIFY ADEQUATE METHODS FOR DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND SAMPLING?**
4.1.1	Clear and complete justification and description of the choice of methods and analysis for all types of data
4.1.2	Where relevant, the methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
4.1.3	The evaluation makes explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?
4.1.4	Does the report demonstrate that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools?
4.1.5	Evaluation design and set of methods is relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope; and are fully and clearly described.

4.1.6	Data sources are appropriate; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) and are all clearly described.
4.1.7	The sampling strategy is provided; it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).
QUESTION 4.2	**ARE ETHICAL ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS DESCRIBED? THE EVALUATION SHOULD BE GUIDED BY THE UNEG ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION.**
4.2.1	There is contextualized reference to the UNEG norms and standards (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.
4.2.2	Descriptions are provided of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, fairness representation, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm).
QUESTION 4.3	**DOES THE EVALUATION USE QUESTIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA APPROPRIATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION?**
4.3.1	The relevant criteria are specified and questions are aligned with these. For example, OECD/DAC criteria: Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations).
4.3.2	In addition to the questions and sub questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.
4.3.3	Do the evaluation questions consider the needs of all intended users of the evaluation?
	SECTION 4: Summary score & advice for improvement
Section 5	**Findings and conclusions**
QUESTION 5.1	**DO THE FINDINGS CLEARLY ADDRESS ALL EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE?**
5.1.1	Findings marshal and present sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria e.g. there is an explicit use of the object of evaluations result framework/ToC in the formulation of the finding
QUESTION 5.2	**ARE EVALUATION FINDINGS DERIVED FROM THE CONSCIENTIOUS, EXPLICIT, AND JUDICIOUS USE OF THE BEST AVAILABLE, OBJECTIVE, RELIABLE AND VALID DATA AND BY ACCURATE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE?**

5.2.1	Evaluation uses credible qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome level data as relevant to the evaluation design. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.
5.2.2	Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative (i.e., follow logically from the analysis). (external validity)
5.2.3	Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.
5.2.4	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression or not from implementation to results).
5.2.6	Does the evaluation assess how the object of evaluation may have an effect?
5.2.7	Are the results presented against the evaluation questions?
5.2.8	Do the analysis and findings include an appropriate reflection of the views of different stakeholders (reflecting diverse interests and underlying power dynamics)?
5.2.9	Are issues of attribution and/ or contribution appropriately considered?
5.2.10	Are the findings presented in ways that they are available, accessible, adaptable (and acceptable) to the intended users?
QUESTION 5.3	**DO THE CONCLUSIONS CLEARLY PRESENT AN OBJECTIVE OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVENTION?**
5.3.1	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.
5.3.2	Conclusions flow clearly from findings and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention.
5.3.3	Where appropriate the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide insight into and analysis of the underlying issues of the program/initiative/system being evaluated?
	SECTION 5: Summary score & advice for improvement
Section 6	**Recommendations and lessons learnt**
QUESTION 6.1	**ARE RECOMMENDATIONS WELL-GROUNDED IN THE EVALUATION?**
6.1.1	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated, and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.

6.1.2	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.
6.1.3	Process(es) for developing the recommendations is described, and in consideration/consultation with key stakeholders involved in the evaluation when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not).
QUESTION 6.2	**ARE RECOMMENDATIONS CLEARLY PRESENTED?**
6.2.1	There is a clear identification of stakeholder groups responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations).
6.2.2	There is clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use (i.e., management response and follow-up). A timeframe for implementation is proposed.
6.2.3	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial.
QUESTION 6.3	**ARE LOGICAL AND INFORMATIVE LESSONS IDENTIFIED?**
6.3.1	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, and have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.
6.3.2	The report includes a description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phases)?
	SECTION 6: Summary score& advice for improvement
Section 7	**Structure and presentation of the report**
QUESTION 7.1	**IS THE REPORT CLEARLY STRUCTURED AND ACCESSIBLE TO THE**
7.1.1	Opening pages include Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes, list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.
7.1.2	Annexes include, if not in report body: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include additional details on methodology, results chain, information about the evaluator(s).
QUESTION 7.2	**IS THE REPORT LOGICALLY STRUCTURED?**
7.2.1	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, and subtitles, well formatted) and structured in a logical way i.e. context, purpose and methods would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
QUESTION 7.3	**IS THE REPORT EASY TO READ AND UNDERSTAND?**

7.3.1	The report is written in an accessible and consistent style, appropriate for the audience, with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?
QUESTION 7.4	**THE REPORT IS A REASONABLE LENGTH**
7.4.1	The report concisely reflects coverage of the objectives and key evaluation questions
	SECTION 7: Summary score& advice for improvement
Section 8	**Evaluation principles (TBC)**
8.1.1	Does the analysis consider equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?
8.2.1	Do the design, methods, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations consider gender equality ?
8.2.3	Do the design, methods, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations consider human rights?
	SECTION 8: Summary assessment & advice for improvement
TOTAL SCORE	(0-8)