



Checklist for Assessing Evaluation Reports

High quality, evidence-based evaluation reports with a clear focus on decision-making for the U.S. Department of State (DoS) and other key partners are critical for improving DoS' effectiveness. DoS and evaluators need to work collaboratively to produce high quality evaluation reports using clear and specific standards.

This checklist consists of 20 critical items that should be addressed in early drafts of an evaluation report. As the report is finalized, we recommend that you assess it against the checklist to ensure high technical quality, a strong executive summary, and targeted recommendations for decision-making purposes. Ensuring that evaluation reports are broadly disseminated—and actively communicated—is critical for learning, program improvement, and accountability purposes. Make sure to pay attention not only to the technical quality of evaluations but also to promoting their use and impact.

EVALUATION REPORT CHECKLIST ⁱ

Title of Study Being Reviewed: _____

Main Implementer(s): _____

Reviewer: _____

Date of Review: _____

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1 2 3 4 5	Reviewer Comments
Key: 1 = Not addressed; 2 = Poorly/partially addressed; 3 = Adequately addressed; 4 = More than adequately addressed; 5 = Exemplar.		
STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT		

1. Is the report well-organized (each topic is clearly delineated, subheadings used for easy reading)?	1 2 3 4 5	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		
2. Does the evaluation report begin with a 3- to 5-page stand-alone summary of the purpose, background of the project, main evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (if applicable) of the evaluation?	1 2 3 4 5	

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1 2 3 4 5	Reviewer Comments
INTRODUCTION		
3. Is there a clear statement of how the evaluation will be used and who the intended users are?	1 2 3 4 5	
4. Does the evaluation address all evaluation questions included in the Statement of Work (SOW)?	1 2 3 4 5	
4.1. Are any modifications to the SOW—whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology, or timeline—indicated in the report?	1 2 3 4 5	
4.2. Is the SOW presented as an annex?	1 2 3 4 5	
4.3. If so, does the annex include the rationale for any change with the written sign-offs on the changes by the technical officer?	1 2 3 4 5	
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY		
5. Is there a clear description of the evaluation’s data collection methods (summarized in the text with the full description presented in an annex)?	1 2 3 4 5	
5.1. Are all tools (questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, and other data collection instruments) used in the evaluation provided in an annex?	1 2 3 4 5	
6. Are all sources of information properly identified and listed in an annex?	1 2 3 4 5	
7. Does the evaluation report contain a section describing the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, small samples, etc.)?	1 2 3 4 5	

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1 2 3 4 5	Reviewer Comments
ANALYSIS		
8. Are relevant charts/graphs used to present or summarize data?	1 2 3 4 5	

FINDINGS		
9. Are findings specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative and qualitative evidence?	1 2 3 4 5	
9.1. As appropriate, does the report indicate confirmatory evidence for findings from multiple sources, data collection methods, and analytic procedures?	1 2 3 4 5	

CONCLUSIONS		
10. Is every conclusion in the report supported by a specific or clearly defined set of findings?	1 2 3 4 5	
RECOMMENDATIONS		

11. Are all recommendations supported by a specific or clearly defined set of findings and conclusions (clearly derived from what the evaluation team learned)?	1 2 3 4 5	
12. Are the recommendations practical and specific?	1 2 3 4 5	
13. Are the recommendations responsive to the purpose of the evaluation?	1 2 3 4 5	

14. Are the recommendations action-oriented?	1 2 3 4 5	
15. Is it clear who is responsible for each action?	1 2 3 4 5	
LESSONS LEARNED		

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	1 2 3 4 5	Reviewer Comments
16. Did this evaluation include lessons that would be useful for future projects or programs, on the same thematic area or in the same country, etc.?	1 2 3 4 5	
BOTTOM LINE		

17. Does the evaluation report give the appearance of a thoughtful, evidence-based, and well-organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not, and why?	1 2 3 4 5	
18. Does the evaluation report explicitly link the evaluation questions to specific future decisions to be made by DoS leadership, partner governments and/or other key stakeholders?	1 2 3 4 5	
19. Does the evaluation report convey the sense that the evaluation was undertaken in a manner to ensure credibility, objectivity, transparency, and the generation of high quality information and	1 2 3 4 5	

REPORT DISSEMINATION		
20. Has a dissemination plan been developed for this report?	1 2 3 4 5	

¹ Good practices in evaluation reporting have been drawn from the following resources:

Morra Imas, Linda and Ray C. Rist. 2009. *The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Scriven, Michael. 2005. *Key Evaluation Checklist*.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. 1999. *Program Evaluations Metaevaluation Checklist*