



► Checklist 4.7: Rating The Quality Of An Evaluation Report

► **Date:** January 2025 v.2 (v.1 2021)

This checklist is to be read in conjunction with ► [Guidance Note 4.1](#)

This checklist is meant to assist evaluation managers to appraise the quality of independent project evaluation reports. It can also serve as quality guidance to the evaluator.¹ The checklist should be used as a rating matrix for project evaluations.

This checklist is to be read in conjunction with [Guidance Note 4.1](#)

Rating dimensions: Insert the appropriate rating on the right side of each statement.

0 = No (or not addressed)²

2 = Sufficient level of quality

1 = Clear need for improvement

3 = Yes (or high quality)

N/A = Not applicable³

1. The results of this quality control are not made public.

2. Some criteria have only a binary dimension of yes/no or there/ not there. These criteria are marked [0/3 only] and can only be rated either 0 or 3, but not 1 or 2.

3. Only criteria marked [N/A possible] can be rated N/A, all others require a rating.

This guidance note is a living document and has not been professionally edited.

Right-click on hyperlinks and select 'Open in new tab' to access, if viewing in browser.

A	Title Page	Score
1.1	The title page and opening pages provide key basic information and use the standard template	
	Total	
Comments:		
B	Executive Summary	Score
2.1	Explanation of the project’s purpose, logic, structure and objectives (project background)	
2.2	Overview of the purpose, scope, clients of the evaluation, time period, geographical coverage and groups or beneficiaries of the evaluation (evaluation background)	
2.3	Concise description of the evaluation’s methodology	
2.4	Summary of all the evaluation findings	
2.5	Concise list of conclusions	
2.6	List of all lessons learned and emerging good practices	
2.7	List all recommendations (must be aligned with the conclusions)	
	Total	
Comments:		
C	Body of the Evaluation Report	Score
3	Project background	
3.1	Brief outline of the economic, political, social, cultural, historical context of the country	
3.2	Description of the project’s purpose, logic, structure and objectives	
3.3	Description of the context and intervention logic, specifically outlining the ToC, and the geographic coverage	
3.4	Brief description/review of the project’s implementation (major events and milestones)	
3.5	Description of the project’s funding arrangements (including the donor)	
3.6	Description of the organizational arrangements for the project’s implementation	
3.7	Description of contributions and role of ILO, the project partners and other stakeholders	
	3.8 Description of how the project took into account cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and disability inclusion during the project's design and implementation	
	Total	

4	Evaluation background
4.1	Description of the purpose and primary use of the evaluation
4.2	Description of the scope of the evaluation (geographic coverage, evaluated time period, and special focus areas)
4.3	Notes the clients of the evaluation and the main audience of the report (e.g. donors, constituents, implementing parties)
4.4	Description of dates, events and operation sequence of the evaluation
	Total
5	Criteria and Questions
5.1	Evaluation criteria covered by the evaluation (as per the OECD/DAC)
5.2	Outline of evaluation questions
5.3	Detailed description of how the evaluation criteria and questions specifically address: - gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination - cross-cutting theme on tripartism and social dialogue, - cross-cutting theme on International Labour Standards, - cross-cutting theme on environmental sustainability, - cross-cutting theme on medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives
	Total
6	Methodology
6.1	The evaluation approach used (e.g. mixed methods, goal-based, etc.)
6.2	Description of evaluation methods and data collection instruments
6.3	Description of the sources of information/data used is described
6.4	Explanation of sampling procedures including how they were made representative for both gender equality and disability inclusion
6.5	Type of analysis (qualitative data analysis, descriptive statistics, etc.)
6.6	List of limitations and potential bias
6.7	Description and rationale for stakeholder participation
6.8	Description of norms, standards and ethical safeguards
	Total

7	Main findings
7.1	Findings are relevant to the purpose and scope of the evaluation
7.2	All evaluation questions are addressed or explanations given when not answered
7.3	Findings are supported by evidence and are consistent with methods and data
7.4	Cross-cutting issues such as: (i) gender issues; (ii) tripartite and social dialogue issues (iii) international labour standards, (iv) environmental sustainability and (v) medium and long-term effects of capacity development action are assessed (vi) disability inclusion
7.5	All data is disaggregated by sex, age, disability status, ethnic group or other relevant demographic categories, where feasible
7.6	Unintended and unexpected results are included
7.7	Factors that have contributed to the success/failure of the project (or elements) are identified and discussed
	Total
	Comments:

D	Conclusions	Score
8.1	Conclusions were formulated by synthesizing the main findings into summary judgments of merit and worth	
8.2	The evaluative reasoning and critical thinking used to formulate the conclusions must be clear	
8.3	Judgments are fair, impartial, and consistent with the findings	
8.4	Conclusions reflect the analysis of cross-cutting themes conducted in the evaluation	
8.5	Brief discussion of how validity and reliability of the conclusions was determined	
	Total	
	Comments:	

E	Lessons Learned	Score
9.1	Is the lesson significant? Does it deal with a non-trivial matter?	
9.2	Does the lesson concisely capture the context from which it was derived?	
9.3	Is the lesson applicable in different contexts?	
9.4	Is it clear in which situations they could be reused in future?	
9.5	Does the lesson identify target users?	
9.6	Does the lesson specifically suggest what should be repeated or avoided in future contexts to guide future action?	
	Total	
	Comments:	

F	Emerging good practices	Score
10.1	Does it describe how it works?	
10.2	Does it concisely capture the context from which it was derived?	
10.3	Is it applicable in different contexts?	
10.4	Is it potentially replicable in different contexts?	
10.5	Does it identify target users?	
10.6	Does it demonstrate their link with specific impacts?	
	Total	

Comments:

G	Recommendations	Score
11.1	Recommendations are concise and supported by evidence and follow logically from the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and emerging good practices	
11.2	Recommendations specify who is called upon to act	
11.3	Recommendations specify action that is needed to remedy the situation	
11.4	Recommendations distinguish priority or importance (high, medium, low)	
11.5	Recommendations specify the time frame for implementation (short-term, medium-term, long-term, not applicable)	
11.6	Acknowledge whether there are resource implications (e.g. low, medium, high)	
	11.7 Include a recommendation relating to cross-cutting issues such as disability inclusion and/or gender equality	

Total and Comments:

H	Appendices	Score
11.1	Lessons learned template (one per lesson)	
11.2	Emerging good practice template (one per good practice)	
11.3	Terms of reference	
11.4	List of persons / organizations interviewed	
11.5	Evaluation questions matrix, including data collection instruments	
11.6	Bibliography	
	Total	

Comments:

Grand Total: