

Evaluation Quality Assessment – UNODC Independent Evaluation Section

General Project Information	
Project/Programme Number and Name	
Thematic Area	
Geographic Area (Region, Country)	
Approved budget of the time of the evaluation (USD)	
Type of Evaluation (In-Depth/Independent Project; final/ midterm; other)	
Evaluator(s)	
Date of Evaluation (from MM/YYYY to MM/YYYY)	
Date of Evaluation Report (MM/YYYY)	
Quality Assessment conducted on/by	

OVERALL QUALITY RATING:

SUMMARY:

Quality Assessment Criteria	Assessment Levels: Very Good - Good - Fair - Unsatisfactory	
	Meets Criteria: Y = Yes N = No P = Partially	
1. Structure, Completeness And Clarity Of Report	RATING:	
a. Structure accords to IES Guidelines for Evaluation Reports with the following sequence: Executive Summary; Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and		

Recommendations; Introduction (Background and Context, Evaluation Scope and Methodology, Limitations to the Evaluation); Findings (Design, Relevance, Efficiency, Partnership and Cooperation, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, Human Rights and Gender Equality/mainstreaming, Innovation); Conclusions; Recommendations; Lessons Learned.		
b. Language is empowering and inclusive avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others.		
c. Report is easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible non-technical language appropriate for the intended audience). Visual aids, such as maps and graphs, are used to convey key information. List of acronyms is included.		
d. Report is free from any grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors.		
e. Objectives stated in the terms of reference are adequately addressed.		
f. Issues of human rights and gender equality/mainstreaming are adequately addressed		
g. Report contains a logical sequence: evidence-assessment-findings-conclusions-recommendations.		
h. Composition of Evaluation Team is included and has gender and geographic expertise. Preferably it is gender balanced and includes professionals from countries or regions concerned.		
i. Annexes include at a minimum: evaluation terms of reference; list of persons interviewed and sites visited; list of documents consulted; evaluation tools used.		
2. Executive Summary		RATING:
a. Written as a stand-alone section that provides an overview of the evaluation and presents its main results.		
b. Generally follows the structure of: i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology); iv) Main Conclusions; v) Recommendations.		
c. Summary Matrix presents only the key and most important recommendations from evaluation report.		
d. Findings, sources and recommendations in the Summary Matrix are clear and cohesive, and specify the stakeholder to whom they are addressed.		
e. Maximum length 4 pages, excluding the Summary Matrix.		
3. Evaluation Context And Purpose		RATING:

a. Clear description of the project evaluated is presented.		
b. Logic model and/or the expected results chain, and /or program theory (that at a minimum identifies and links objectives, outcomes and indicators of the project) is clearly described		
c. Context of key cultural, gender related, social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors are described, and the key stakeholders involved in the project implementation and their roles are identified.		
d. Project's status is described including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred.		
e. Purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used, and the target audience.		
4. Scope And Methodology		RATING:
a. Evaluation scope is clearly explained including the main evaluation criteria, questions and justification of what the evaluation did and did not cover.		
b. Transparent description presented of methodology applied; how it was designed to address the evaluation purpose, objectives, questions and criteria is explained.		
c. Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between output and expected outcomes		
d. Gender sensitive methodology aware of power relations during an evaluation process, inclusive and participatory.		
e. Data collection methods and analysis, and data sources are clearly described; as are the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations are clearly described. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.		
f. Sampling frame clearly described and includes area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection including whether random, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of sample.		
g. Methods are appropriate for analysing gender equality/mainstreaming and human rights issues identified in evaluation scope		
h. High degree of participation of internal and external stakeholders, including the Core Learning Partners, throughout the evaluation process is planned for and made explicit. When there are thematic or approach gaps (i.e. gender equality/mainstreaming) among stakeholders, other key informants not directly		

involved in the project were invited for consultation.		
5. Reliability of Data <i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>	RATING:	
a. Triangulation principles (using multiple sources of data and methods) were applied to validate findings.		
b. Qualitative and quantitative data sources were used, and included the range of stakeholder groups and additional key informants (when necessary) defined in evaluation scope.		
c. Limitations that emerged in primary and secondary data sources and collection processes (bias, data gaps, etc.) are identified and, if relevant, actions taken to minimize such issues are explained.		
d. Evidence provided of how data was collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations.		
e. Adequate disaggregation of data by relevant stakeholder undertaken (gender, ethnicity, age, under-represented groups, etc.). If this has not been possible, it is explained.		
6. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>	RATING:	
<i>Findings</i>	-	
a. Have been formulated clearly, take into account any identified benchmarks, and are based on rigorous analysis of the data collected.		
b. Address all evaluation criteria and questions raised in the ToR including relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as UNODC's additional criteria of design, partnership and cooperation, innovation, and the cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender.		
c. Address any limitations or gaps in the evidence and discuss any impacts on responding to evaluation questions raised in ToR.		
d. Discuss any variances between planned and actual results of the project (in terms of objectives, outcomes, outputs).		
e. Are presented in a clear manner.		
<i>Analysis</i>	-	
a. Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions.		

b. Contextual factors are identified (including reasons for accomplishments and failures, and continuing constraints).		
c. Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.		
d. Includes substantive analysis of gender equality/mainstreaming issues		
e. Includes substantive analysis of human rights issues.		
7. CONCLUSIONS		RATING:
a. Take into consideration all evaluation criteria and questions, including human rights and gender equality/mainstreaming criteria.		
b. Have been formulated clearly and are based on findings and substantiated by evidence collected.		
c. Convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement of the intervention		
d. Developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.		
e. Present a comprehensive picture of both the strengths and weaknesses of the project.		
f. Go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the project and add value to the findings.		
8. RECOMMENDATIONS		RATING:
a. Clearly formulated, based on the conclusions, substantiated by evidence collected.		
b. Address flaws, if any, in project's data acquisition processes.		
c. Are specific, realistic, time-bound and actionable, and of a manageable number.		
d. Are clustered and prioritized.		
e. Reflect stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining balanced and impartial		
f. Clearly identify a target group for action.		
9. LESSONS LEARNED		RATING:
a. Are correctly identified, innovative and add value to common knowledge.		
b. Are based on specific evidence and analysis drawn from the evaluation.		
c. Have wider applicability and relevance to the specific subject and context.		

SCORING

Element Of The Evaluation	Points Per Category	Points Awarded			
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
Presentation And Completeness	10				

Executive Summary	5				
Evaluation Context And Purpose	5				
Evaluation Scope And Methodology	10				
Reliability Of Data	5				
Findings And Analysis	35				
Conclusions	10				
Recommendations	15				
Lessons Learned	5				
Total Maximum Score	100				
		Very Good -> very confident to use	Good -> confident to use	Fair -> use with caution	Unsatisfactory -> not confident to use

ASSESSMENT OF THE INTEGRATION OF GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN (GEEW) for UN-SWAP

Quality Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score (0-3)
a. GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.		
b. Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.		
c. Gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.		
d. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.		
Overall Score		
Overall Rating		

UN-SWAP Scoring System

Exceeding Requirements	3 - Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required
Meeting Requirements	2 - Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done
Approaching Requirements	1 - Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.
Missing	0 - Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.
Overall Calculation	11-12 = very good 8-10 = good 4-7 = Fair 0-3=unsatisfactory