

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

Quality Assessment for Evaluation Support Study Final Report

DG/Unit AGRI unit C.4 Monitoring and evaluation

Official(s) managing the evaluation: AGRI C.4 Ms Olivan

Evaluator: AGRA CEAS (IHS Markit and ARETE)

Assessment carried out by(*):

Steering group (ISG) X

Evaluation Function X

Other (please specify)

(*): Multiple crosses possible

Date of assessment [03/09/2020 - ISG discussion]

Objective of the assessment	Aspects to be assessed	Fulfilled? Y, N, N/A	Comments
1. Scope of evaluation	Confirm with the Terms of Reference and the work plan that the contractor :		
	a. Has addressed the evaluation issues and specific questions	Y	The contractor addressed all issues from the Terms of Reference (ToR) and all the evaluation questions, but not at the same level of detail
	b. Has undertaken the tasks described in the work plan	Y	
	c. Has covered the requested scope for time period, geographical areas, target groups, aspects of the intervention, etc.	Y	The geographical and the time scope were covered. The intervention logic focussed on instruments/measures.

2. Overall contents of report	Check that the report includes:		
	a. Executive Summary according to an agreed format, in the three required languages (minimum EN and FR)	Y	The executive summary was delivered in EN and FR according to the agreed format.
	b. Main report with required components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title and Content Page ▪ A description of the policy being evaluated, its context, the purpose of the evaluation, contextual limitations, methodology, etc. ▪ Findings, conclusions, and judgments for all evaluation issues and specific questions ▪ The required outputs and deliverables ▪ Recommendations as appropriate 	Y	The contractor addressed the elements of the ToR in the main report.

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

	c. All required annexes	Y	All required annexes were submitted.
3. Data collection	Check that data is accurate and complete		
	a. Data is accurate	Y	The contractor performed the required data collection. ISSG colleagues provided considerable input, in particular for consistency (evaluation study questions (ESQs)), corresponding findings, conclusions and recommendations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data is free from factual and logical errors ▪ The report is consistent, i.e. no contradictions ▪ Calculations are correct 		
	b. Data is complete	Y	The data collected are fit for the purpose of this evaluation. For the data collection, the contractor conducted case studies in ten Member States according to established selection criteria. For certain evaluation criteria, mainly qualitative elements were available.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant literature and previous studies have been sufficiently reviewed ▪ Existing monitoring data has been appropriately used ▪ Limitations to the data retrieved are pointed out and explained. ▪ Correcting measures have been taken to address any problems encountered in the process of data gathering 			
4. Analysis and judgments	Check that analysis is sound and relevant		
	a. Analytical framework is sound	Y	The analytical framework was sound. The methodological approach includes quantitative and qualitative approaches to address the different types of analysis that are required to respond to the evaluation questions. However, given the scope, time limitations and resources, the level of detail is sometimes uneven. The findings address the evaluation questions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The methodology used for each area of analysis is clearly explained, and has been applied consistently and as planned ▪ Judgements are based on transparent criteria ▪ The analysis relies on two or more independent lines of evidence ▪ Inputs from different stakeholders are used in a balanced way ▪ Findings are reliable enough to be replicable 		
b. Conclusions are sound	Y	The contractor	

CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conclusions are properly addressing the evaluation questions and are coherently and logically substantiated ▪ There are no relevant conclusions missing according to the evidence presented ▪ Findings corroborate existing knowledge; differences or contradictions with existing knowledge are explained ▪ Critical issues are presented in a fair and balanced manner ▪ Limitations on validity of the conclusions are pointed out 	<p>performed the assessments on the established evaluation criteria, which resulted in sound findings and conclusions. Final conclusions are based on evaluation questions' conclusions. Results are balanced and addressing the evaluation questions.</p>	
<p>5. Usefulness of recommendations</p>	<p>a. Recommendations are useful</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>	<p>Recommendations were provided based on the aforementioned conclusions and underlying findings.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, are practical, realistic, and addressed to the relevant Commission Service(s) or other stakeholders 		
	<p>b. Recommendations are complete</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations cover all relevant main conclusions 		
<p>6. Clarity of the report</p>	<p>a. Report is easy to read</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>	<p>Taking into account that the subject is very technical, the report is sometimes not easy to read for the uninitiated.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Written style and presentation is adapted for the various relevant target readers ▪ The quality of language is sufficient for publishing ▪ Specific terminology is clearly defined ▪ Tables, graphs, and similar presentation tools are used to facilitate understanding; they are well commented with narrative text 		
	<p>b. Report is logical and focused</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>	<p>The structure of the report follows the agreed form of the deliverable.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The structure of the report is logical and consistent, information is not unjustifiably duplicated, and it is easy to get an overview of the report and its key results. ▪ The report provides a proper focus on main issues and key messages are summarised and highlighted ▪ 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; thus information overload is avoided in the main report 		

<p>Overall conclusion</p>		
<p>The report could be approved in its current state, as it overall complies with the contractual conditions and relevant professional evaluation standards</p>	<p align="center">Y</p>	<p>The deliverables were approved by the steering group.</p>