

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way




Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows		
1. Clarity of the report		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers Highlight the key messages The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report) Avoid unnecessary duplications Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score



Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology • The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations • The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
3. Validity of Findings		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings derive from the evidence gathered • Findings address all selected evaluation criteria • Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources • When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts • The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
4. Validity of conclusions		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis • Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions • Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation • Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations • (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score

Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
5. Usefulness of recommendations		
<p>This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions • Are concrete, achievable and realistic • Are targeted to specific addressees • Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound • (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis <i>(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)</i>		
<p>This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons are identified • When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s) 		
Strengths	Weaknesses	
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
Final comments on the overall quality of the report		Overall score