

Revised Quality Assessment Tool 19 June 2015

New #	Phase	Assessment area	Standard	Weighting	Overarching Consideration	Standards V2 Reference	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	SP
1	1. Planning & Design	Quality of the TOR	The evaluation was guided by a well-structured and complete TOR or a well-structured and complete internal evaluation proposal (e.g. Background, Purpose, Evaluation Questions, Design & Methodology, Deliverables & Timeframes, Resource requirements, Intended Audience & Utilisation, etc).	10	1.6 Quality control	2.1	There is no TOR or internal evaluation proposal available, or the TOR was never finalised	The evaluation was guided by a TOR or internal evaluation proposal but it was not well-structured or omitted a number of key sections	The evaluation was guided by a well-structured and complete TOR or internal evaluation proposal of an adequate standard	The evaluation was guided by a well-structured and complete TOR or internal evaluation proposal of a good standard	The evaluation was guided by a well-structured and complete TOR or internal evaluation proposal of exceptional quality, exhaustive and thorough in content	
2			The approach and type of evaluation was suited to the purpose and scope of the evaluation TOR (or an internal evaluation proposal)	8	1.6 Quality control	2.1	There is no TOR or internal evaluation proposal available, or the approach and type of evaluation was not stated in the TOR	The approach and type of the evaluation requested in the TOR was not appropriate given the purpose and scope of the evaluation	The approach and type of evaluation was suited to the purpose and scope of the evaluation TOR (or an internal evaluation proposal)	The approach and type of the evaluation was well-suited to the purpose and scope of the evaluation TOR	The approach and type of the evaluation was perfectly matched to the purpose and scope of the evaluation TOR and there was a reinforcing complementarity between the sections	
3			The TOR (or an internal evaluation proposal) identified the intended users of the evaluation and their information needs	6	1.1 Partnership approach	2.4	There is no TOR or internal evaluation proposal available, or the TOR made no mention of the users of the evaluation or their information needs	The TOR made only implicit or indirect mention of the users of the evaluation and their information needs	The TOR (or an internal evaluation proposal) identified the intended users of the evaluation and their information needs	The TOR identified the intended users of the evaluation and differentiated between their information needs well	The TOR identified the intended users of the evaluation at length and specified each user's information needs in relation to possible uses of the evaluation in depth	
4			Key stakeholders were involved in the scoping of the TOR and choosing the purpose of the evaluation	8	1.1 Partnership approach	2.4	There is no TOR or internal evaluation proposal available, or there is no evidence of any consultation amongst evaluation stakeholders in the development of the TOR	There is evidence of an attempt to engage key stakeholders in the scoping of the TOR but they were not meaningfully consulted in choosing the purpose of the evaluation	Key stakeholders were involved in the scoping of the TOR and choosing the purpose of the evaluation	A wider range of stakeholders (i.e. beyond government stakeholders) were meaningfully involved in the scoping of the TOR and choosing the purpose of the evaluation	A wider range of key stakeholders (i.e. beyond government stakeholders) were meaningfully involved in the scoping of the TOR and chose the purpose of the evaluation with clear consideration of other relevant sector work	
5		Adequacy of resourcing	The evaluation was adequately resourced in terms of time and budget allocated	6	1.7 Project Management	2.3	It was clear from the outset that the evaluation could not be completed as envisioned within the existing timeframes and budget	The evaluation was resourced with tight timeframes and budget which were challenging from the outset	The evaluation was adequately resourced in terms of time and budget allocated	The evaluation was well resourced in terms of the time and budget allocated (i.e. there was some room for flexibility)	The evaluation was very well resourced in terms of the time and budget allocated in relation to the scope, budget and duration of the programme (i.e. allowing for the necessary flexibility to cover the programme well)	
6			The team conducting the evaluation was adequately resourced in terms of staffing and skills sets	8	No Overarching alignment	2.3 + 2.5	The evaluation was grossly understaffed or deprived of vital skills sets for the type and sector of the evaluation	The evaluation was under-staffed or lacked some skills sets appropriate for the type and sector of the evaluation	The evaluation was adequately resourced in terms of staffing and skills sets	The evaluation was well resourced in terms of staffing and skills sets	The staffing and skills sets required for the evaluation were ideal for the evaluation purpose, sector and incorporated high quality, internationally recognised expertise	Y
7		Appropriateness of the evaluation design and methodology	There was explicit reference to the intervention logic or the theory of change of the evaluand in the planning of the evaluation	6	1.2 Free and open evaluation process	2.2	There was no reference to the intervention logic or the theory of change in the TOR or the Inception Report	There was implied or indirect reference to the intervention logic or the theory of change in the TOR or the Inception Report	There was explicit reference to the intervention logic or the theory of change of the evaluand in the TOR or the Inception Report	The intervention logic or theory of change meaningfully informed and shaped the TOR or the Inception Report, including a visual representation	The intervention logic or theory of change of the evaluand was well integrated into the TOR and the Inception Report, including visual representations, and informed the design of the evaluation	Y
8			The planned methodology was appropriate to the questions being asked	8	No Overarching alignment	2.2	The planned methodology was clearly inappropriate for generating the requisite data to answer the evaluation questions asked	The planned methodology was not entirely appropriate for addressing all of the questions being asked	The planned methodology was appropriate to the questions being asked	The planned methodology was well suited to the questions being asked and considered the data available	The planned methodology was creative and very well suited to the questions being asked and should have generated the requisite data to answer the evaluation questions asked completely	Y
9			The sampling planned was appropriate and adequate given the focus and purpose of evaluation	8	No Overarching alignment	2.2	The sampling planned was clearly inappropriate given the focus and purpose of the evaluation	The sampling planned was not entirely appropriate given the focus and purpose of the evaluation	The sampling planned was appropriate and adequate given focus and purpose of evaluation	The sampling planned was good given the focus, purpose and context of the evaluation	The sampling planned was creative and ideal for the focus, purpose and context of the evaluation	Y
10		Project management (Planning phase)	The inception phase was used to develop a common agreement on how the evaluation would be implemented	6	1.7 Project Management	2.6	There was no indication that there was an inception phase or that it was used to develop a common agreement on how the evaluation would be implemented	There was an inception phase but it was not utilised appropriately or failed to affirm a common agreement on how the evaluation would be implemented	The inception phase was used to develop a common agreement on how the evaluation would be implemented	The inception phase was used to good effect to achieve a common agreement and understanding of how the evaluation would be implemented	The inception phase was used to maximum effect to ensure a common agreement between all stakeholders and a shared understanding of how the evaluation would be implemented	

11	2. Implementation	Evaluation ethics and independence	Where data was gathered in contexts where ethical sensitivity is high, informed consent, assurances of confidentiality and appropriate clearance were achieved; e.g. through an ethics review board, in evaluation involving minors, institutions where access usually requires ethical or bureaucratic clearance	6	1.3 Evaluation Ethics	3.3	There was no evidence that ethical protocols, informed consent agreements and/or an ethics review was undertaken prior to data collection	Although there were indications that ethical protocols were observed, (e.g. informed consent agreements and/or an ethics review) no documentary evidence was available to support this	There was clear evidence that ethical protocols were observed for some data collection instances including: informed consent agreements; confidentiality; documenting and storing data notes, recordings or transcripts; and ethics review board approvals where appropriate	There was clear evidence that ethical protocols were observed for most data collection instances including: informed consent agreements; confidentiality; documenting and storing data notes, recordings or transcripts; Where data was gathered in contexts where ethical sensitivity is high, appropriate clearance was achieved through an ethics review board; e.g. in evaluation involving minors, institutions where access usually requires ethical or bureaucratic clearance, and situations where assurances of confidentiality was offered to participants	There was clear evidence that best practice ethical protocols in the sector were observed in all data collection instances including: informed consent agreements; confidentiality; documenting and storing data notes, recordings or transcripts; and ethics review board approvals	Y
12			Where external, the evaluation team was able to work without significant interference and given access to existing data and information sources	6	1.2 Free and open evaluation process	3.1	There was significant evidence that the evaluation team was interfered with, unable to work freely or was not given the necessary access to data and information sources	There was some evidence that the evaluation team was not supported to get access to existing data and information sources	The evaluation team was able to work without significant interference and was given access to existing data and information sources	The evaluation team was able to work freely without interference and was given access to all sought data and information sources	The evaluation team was able to work freely and independently without interference and significant efforts were documented to ensure unfettered access to all existing data and information sources	
13		Participation and M&E skills development	Key stakeholders were involved in the evaluation through a formalised mechanism or institutional arrangement	8	1.1 Partnership approach	3.2	Key stakeholders were not involved in the evaluation through any institutional arrangements	There was evidence that key stakeholders were consulted either indirectly or informally outside of an institutional arrangement	Key stakeholders were involved in the evaluation through a formalised mechanism or institutional arrangement (e.g. a steering committee or reference group)	Key stakeholders were regularly, actively involved in the evaluation and contributed through a formalised mechanism or institutional arrangement (e.g. a steering committee or reference group)	A wide set of stakeholders including beneficiary representatives were regularly, actively involved in the evaluation and contributed through a formalised mechanism or institutional arrangement and formally fed updates on the evaluation back into organisations' management mechanisms	
14			Where appropriate, an element of capacity building of partners responsible for the evaluand and evaluators was incorporated into the evaluation process	6	1.5 Capacity development	No Phase ref, Overarching Consideration	There was no evidence of any capacity building of partners responsible for the evaluand or evaluators being incorporated into the evaluation process	There was some evidence of capacity building of partners responsible for the evaluand or evaluators but this was either unstructured or incomplete	An element of capacity building of partners responsible for the evaluand and evaluators was incorporated into the evaluation process	Structured capacity building of evaluators and partners responsible for the evaluand was incorporated into the evaluation process	Well thought-through capacity building of evaluators and partners responsible for the evaluand occurred as per the plan which was supported by evidence of learning throughout the process	Y
15			A literature review was developed which informed the analytical framework and findings of the evaluation	8	1.4 Alignment to policy context and background literature	No Phase ref, Overarching Consideration	A literature review was not undertaken or was very poor	A literature review was undertaken but was not well developed eg a limited set of literature, not sufficiently analysed, or not used to inform the analytical framework or findings	An adequate literature review was developed in terms of coverage and analysis which informed the analytical framework and findings of the evaluation	A good quality literature review was developed which was insightful in terms of the analytical framework and provided good context for the findings	An excellent literature review was developed covering international and national literature, a diversity of view points, which informed the analytical framework and interpretation of issues relevant to the findings	Y
16			The methods employed in the process of the evaluation were consistent with those planned and implemented adequately	8	1.7 Project Management	No Phase ref	The methods employed in the process of the evaluation significantly deviated from those planned, or ignored the planned methods entirely, or were implemented poorly	The methods employed in the process of the evaluation deviated somewhat from those planned or implementation was inadequate	The methods employed in the process of the evaluation were consistent with those planned and implemented adequately	The methods employed in the process of the evaluation were consistent with those planned and implemented well (in terms of time, coverage, and content)	The methods employed in the process of the evaluation exceeded the provisions of those planned, were very well implemented and significantly improved on the scope and quality of data available for analysis	
17		Methodological integrity	A pilot of basic data collection instrumentation occurred prior to undertaking data collection and it was used to inform the research process	8	1.6 Quality control	No Phase ref	No pilot of any data collection instrumentation took place prior to data collection	A pilot of data collection instrumentation occurred but not in a way that could meaningfully test or improve upon instrumentation	A pilot of basic data collection instrumentation occurred prior to undertaking data collection and it was used to inform the research process	All components of the data collection instrumentation were piloted which led to some improvements in the data collection instrumentation or affirmation of the instruments	All components of data collection instrumentation were piloted considering implications of the diversity of application (e.g. tools, representative sites, mediums, languages, etc) which allowed for further refinement of all data collection instrumentation and informed the research process to an excellent quality standard	Y
18			Data was collected from key stakeholders (e.g. implementers, governance structures, indirectly affected stakeholders) as data sources	6	1.1 Partnership approach	3.2	Data was not collected from several key stakeholders either directly or indirectly	Data was not collected from a key stakeholder either directly or indirectly	Data was collected from key stakeholders (e.g. Implementers, governance structures, indirectly affected stakeholders) as data sources	Data was collected from the intended key stakeholder groupings in line with the envisioned range and type of stakeholders (approx. 80-89% of intended)	Data was collected from all of the key stakeholder groupings identified in the research plan and the intended sample was well achieved (approx. 90-100% of those intended)	Y

19		The methodology included engaging beneficiaries appropriately as a key source of data and information	8	1.1 Partnership approach	3.2	There was no evidence that beneficiaries or beneficiary representative perspectives were incorporated as a key source of data and information	The methodology included beneficiary representative perspectives but did not include beneficiaries directly as a key source of data	The methodology included engaging beneficiaries as a source of data and information (or if based on secondary data, includes data from beneficiaries)	The methodology included meaningfully engaging beneficiaries as a primary source of data and information (or if based on secondary data, includes data from beneficiaries and beneficiaries consulted on emerging findings)	Beneficiaries were thoroughly and representatively included as the primary source of data amongst multiple sources of data and information (or if based on secondary data, includes data from beneficiaries and beneficiaries consulted on emerging findings and provide meaningful input to recommendations)	Y
20	Project management (Implementation phase)	The steering committee, technical working group and service provider worked together adequately to facilitate achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	8	1.7 Project Management	3.2	The relationship between the steering committee, technical working group and service provider was very poor and undermined the achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	The relationship between the steering committee, technical working group and service provider was inadequate with some challenges to the achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	The steering committee, technical working group and service provider worked together adequately to facilitate achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	The steering committee, technical working group and service provider worked together in a flexible and constructive manner facilitating achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	The steering committee, technical working group and service provider worked together in a creative, flexible and constructive manner facilitating achievement of a high quality evaluation	
21		Support provided by the evaluation secretariat (e.g. the administrators responsible for the evaluation) facilitated achievement of the objectives of the evaluation (eg turnaround times, addressing problems, preparation for	8	1.7 Project Management	3.4	There was very poor support provided by the evaluation secretariat which undermined achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	The support provided by the evaluation secretariat was inadequate with some challenges to the achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	Support provided by the evaluation secretariat facilitated achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	Good support was provided by the evaluation secretariat and facilitates timely and constructive achievement of the objectives of the evaluation	Excellent support was provided by the evaluation secretariat helping to ensure an effective evaluation	
22	Completeness of the evaluation report	The first draft evaluation report was of a sufficient quality to go to stakeholders and did not require major changes	10	1.6 Quality control	4.2	A first draft of the evaluation report was never submitted prior to finalisation of the evaluation	A first draft of the evaluation report was of a poor quality and required major changes	A first draft of the evaluation report was of a sufficient quality to go to stakeholders and did not require major changes prior to sharing	A first draft of the evaluation report was of a good quality and required only minor changes prior to finalisation	A first draft of the evaluation report was of an excellent quality, insightful, and only required very minor changes to content, cosmetic or formatting changes	Y
23		The final evaluation report is well-structured and complete in terms of the following: executive summary; context of the development evaluation; evaluation purpose, questions and scope; methodology; findings and analysis; conclusions and recommendations	10	1.6 Quality control	4.4	The final evaluation report lacks structure, omits key components and is incomplete	The final evaluation report is poorly structured and does not address all of the following components: executive summary; background/context of the evaluation; evaluation purpose, questions and scope; methodology; findings and analysis; conclusions and recommendations	The final evaluation report is complete, follows a clear structure and addresses at minimum: executive summary; background/context of the evaluation; evaluation purpose, questions and scope; methodology; findings and analysis; conclusions and recommendations	The final evaluation report is well-structured, complete and presents the following report components well: executive summary; context of the development evaluation; evaluation purpose, questions and scope; methodology; findings and analysis; conclusions and recommendations	The final evaluation report structure is excellent, complete and makes exceptional use of the appendices to supplement the main report content structure	Y
24	Accessibility of content	The final evaluation report is user-friendly, written in accessible language and adequate for publication (e.g. adequate layout and consistent formatting; complete sentences and no widespread grammatical or typographical errors; consistency of style and writing conventions; levels of formality; references complete and consistent with cited references in reference list and vice versa; etc.)	8	1.2 Free and open evaluation process	4.2	The final evaluation report is very difficult to navigate, written in inaccessible language with many formatting, spelling and grammar mistakes	The final evaluation report is characterised by either inaccessible language or frequent formatting, spelling and grammar mistakes	The final evaluation report is user-friendly, written in accessible language and adequate for sharing (e.g. some spelling, grammar or formatting mistakes but these do not seriously detract from the report)	The final report is well written, accessible to the common reader and ready for publication with only minor spelling, grammar or formatting mistakes	The final evaluation report balances an impressive depth of work with excellent writing that is accessible to the common reader and reflects an excellent publishing standard	Y
25		Figures, tables and appropriate conventions are used in presentation of data (e.g. use of appropriate statistical language; reporting of p-values where appropriate; not reporting statistically insignificant findings as significant; clarifying disaggregation categories in constructing percentages; not using quantitative language in reporting qualitative data, etc.) and are readily discernible to a reader familiar with data presentation conventions	8	1.6 Quality control	4.2	Figures, tables and appropriate conventions are not used in the presentation of data	Some figures, tables and conventions are used in presentation of data but not entirely appropriately or consistently	Figures, tables and appropriate conventions are used in presentation of data and are readily discernible to a reader familiar with data presentation conventions	Figures, tables and conventions are well used for a variety of types of data presentations and supporting explanations make them accessible to readers	A wide variety of figures, tables and different data presentation conventions are used to an expert standard with explanations and additional references supporting comprehension by all readers	Y
26		Data analysis appears to have been executed to an adequate standard	8	1.6 Quality control	4.4.5	There is no indication that even basic data analysis was undertaken for key datasets	Data analysis was executed to an extent but it appears inadequate or significantly lacking for some datasets	Data analysis appears to have been executed to an adequate standard for most datasets	Data analysis appears to have been well executed for all datasets	Data analysis is thorough and well executed to an exceptional standard for all datasets	Y

27	3. Reporting	Robustness of findings	Findings are supported by evidence which is sufficiently and appropriately analysed to support the argument, integrating sources of data	8	1.6 Quality control	4.4.5	There is little to no analysis of the evidence gathered in relation to the positions taken in report (purely descriptive)	The evidence gathered has been analysed to support the argument to an extent but this is not entirely sufficient or appropriate, and different data sources may be presented separately rather than integrated	The evidence gathered is analysed to support the argument to an adequate standard and integrates sources of data	The evidence gathered is well analysed, integrated and supports the argument in key sections of the report, without presenting data which are not used in the argument	Evidence gathered is thoroughly analysed, integrated and very well-presented to produce a convincing and strong argument throughout the evaluation report	Y
28			There is appropriate recognition and exploration of the possibility of alternative interpretations	8	1.6 Quality control	4.4.5	There is no recognition of the possibility of alternative interpretations	There is an implicit or indirect recognition of alternative interpretations	There is appropriate recognition of the possibility of alternative interpretations	There is clear recognition of the possibility of alternative interpretations and these are concisely presented without detracting from other findings	Alternative interpretations of data are presented and their validity is convincingly dispelled through critical analysis	Y
29			The report appears free of significant methodological and analytic flaws	10	1.6 Quality control	4.4.7	There is clear evidence of significant methodological and analytical flaws in the report	The report appears to include some minor methodological and analytic flaws, but these are not significant	The report appears free of significant methodological and analytic flaws	The report documents some of the methodological and analytical processes used to ensure that it is free of methodological and analytic flaws	The report thoroughly documents all methodological and analytical processes while noting external checks and reviews to make a strong case for the absence of any flaws	Y
30			Limitations of all aspects of the methodology and findings are clearly articulated (e.g. limitations of scope or evaluation design, recommendation for additional research, data collection challenges, etc)	6	1.6 Quality control	4.4.6	There is no acknowledgement of the limitations of the methodology or findings	There is some acknowledgment of the limitations of the methodology and findings but these are not clear or exhaustive	Limitations of all aspects of the methodology and findings are articulated	Limitations of all aspects of the methodology and findings are clearly articulated and distinguish between different kinds of limitations	Limitations of all aspects of the methodology are addressed separately and exhaustively with clear distinctions between different kinds of limitations and document steps taken to mitigate or limit the consequences of these limitations	Y
31		Strength of conclusions	Conclusions are derived from evidence	8	1.6 Quality control	4.4.5	The conclusions presented do not appear to be derived from the evidence presented	Conclusions are derived from some evidence but do not encompass all of what was presented	Conclusions are derived from evidence	Conclusions are derived from evidence and well supported by multiple sources of data that has been well analysed	Conclusions are derived from evidence that has been triangulated and thoroughly analysed, limiting any arguments against the conclusions	Y
32			Conclusions address the original evaluation purpose and questions	8	1.2 Free and open evaluation process	4.4.1	Conclusions fail to address the original evaluation purpose and questions	Conclusions address the original evaluation purpose and questions in implicit or indirect terms to an extent	Conclusions adequately address the original evaluation purpose and questions	Conclusions address the original evaluation purpose and questions well	The conclusions are exceptional in the manner that they address the evaluation purpose and questions	Y
33			Conclusions are drawn with explicit reference to the intervention logic or theory of change	8	1.2 Free and open evaluation process	4.4.3	Conclusions fail to make reference to the intervention logic or theory of change	Conclusions make implicit or indirect reference to the intervention logic or theory of change	Conclusions are drawn with explicit reference to the intervention logic or theory of change	Conclusions are drawn with an explicit reference to, and provide a clear judgement on, the intervention logic or theory of change	The conclusions are exceptional in the manner that they provide a judgement on the intervention logic or theory of change and are clearly linked to design recommendations	Y
34		Suitability of recommendations	Recommendations are made in consultation with relevant government officials, stakeholders and sectoral experts	8	1.1 Partnership approach	4.5	There is no evidence that recommendations were made in consultation with relevant government officials, stakeholders or sectoral experts	Recommendations are made with indirect or partial consultation of government officials, stakeholders and sectoral experts	Recommendations are made in consultation with relevant government officials, stakeholders and sectoral experts	Recommendations are made with relevant government officials, stakeholders and sectoral experts beyond the project steering committee, making a significant contribution	Recommendations are made following extensive consultations with relevant government officials, stakeholders and sectoral experts, including beneficiary representatives and draw from cutting edge international experience	Y
35			Recommendations are useful- they are relevant, specific, feasible, affordable and acceptable	8	1.4 Alignment to policy context and background literature	5.1	Recommendations are not useful- they are of questionable relevance, insufficiently specific, not feasible, unaffordable or unacceptable	Recommendations are of limited use - they vary in the degree to which they are relevant, specific, feasible affordable and acceptable	Recommendations are useful- they are relevant, specific, feasible, affordable and acceptable to an extent	Recommendations are well-formulated for use- they begin to differentiate by user and are relevant to the current policy context, specifically targetted, feasible to implement, affordable and acceptable to key stakeholders	Recommendations are exceptionally well-formulated and insightful - they differentiate between users and are relevant to the policy context, specifically targetted, feasible to implement, affordable and acceptable to key stakeholders	Y
36		Acknowledgement of ethical considerations	The full report documents procedures intended to ensure confidentiality and to secure informed consent where necessary (in some cases this is not needed - e.g. evaluation synthesis - in which case N/A should be recorded)	6	1.3 Evaluation Ethics	3.3	The full report fails to document any procedures to ensure confidentiality and secure informed consent where appropriate.	The full report does not acknowledge whether confidentiality was ensured or informed consent secured but there is some evidence that this is the case	The full report documents some procedures intended to ensure confidentiality and to secure informed consent where necessary	The full report documents all procedures to ensure confidentiality and to secure informed consent and provides some examples in appendices	The full report documents all ethical procedures applied in text and provides examples of all confidentiality statements and informed consent agreements as appendices, as well as indicates how data will be stored and/or disposed of in the future	Y
37	There are no risks to participants or institutions in disseminating the evaluation report on a public website		8	1.3 Evaluation Ethics	3.3	There are clear risks to participants or institutions in disseminating any versions of the evaluation report on a public website	There are some risks to either participants or institutions in disseminating a summary version of the evaluation report on a public website	There are no risks to participants or institutions in disseminating a summary version of the evaluation report on a public website	There are no risks to participants or institutions in disseminating the original full evaluation report on a public website	All participants and institutions to the evaluation were formally informed that the original report would be disseminated on a public website and no risks exist	Y	

38	4. Follow-up, use and learning	Resource utilisation	The evaluation was completed within the planned timeframes and budget	6	1.7 Project Management	5.1	The evaluation exceeded the planned timeframes or budget considerably, against the wishes of the commissioning organisations	The evaluation was completed outside of the planned timeframes and over budget, but with approval of the commissioning organisation	The evaluation was completed within the planned timeframes and budget	The evaluation was completed within the planned timeframes and budget and allowed for additional value to be achieved	The evaluation was completed within the planned timeframes and budget with much more value and insight achieved as a result of exceptional project management
39		Evaluation use	Results of the evaluation have been presented to relevant stakeholders	6	1.1 Partnership approach	5.3	The results of the evaluation have not been presented to the relevant stakeholders	Results of the evaluation have been presented to stakeholders involved in the management of the evaluation project only but not more broadly	Results of the evaluation have been presented to relevant stakeholders in government	Results of the evaluation have been presented to all relevant stakeholders, inside and outside of government	Results have been widely presented to all relevant stakeholders inside and outside of government, as well as representatives of the beneficiary groups, academics and international experts, who have been able to engage and influence how the work is taken forward
40			A reflective process has been undertaken by the steering committee with the service provider (if no steering committee exists then by the evaluation management team or the involved department officials) to reflect on what could be done to strengthen future evaluations	4	1.5 Capacity development	5.4	There was no reflective process undertaken by the steering committee on what could be done to strengthen future evaluations	The steering committee undertook a meeting in which some form of reflection occurred, but not in a clear, reflective process	A reflective process has been undertaken by the steering committee with the service provider to reflect on what could be done to strengthen future evaluations	A reflective process has been undertaken by the steering committee with the service provider and reflections on how to strengthen future evaluations have been documented	A reflective process has been undertaken and reflections on how to strengthen future evaluations have been documented, including identification of scarce skills areas, competences in need of improvement and/or relevant capacity building opportunities
41			The evaluation study is seen by interviewed stakeholders as having added significant symbolic value to the policy or programme (e.g. raised its profile)	6	1.4 Alignment to policy context and background literature	5.1	The evaluation study is not seen by interviewed stakeholders as having added significant symbolic value to the policy or programme	The evaluation study is seen by interviewed stakeholders as being of limited symbolic value to the policy or programme	The evaluation study is seen by interviewed stakeholders as being of symbolic value to the policy or programme	The evaluation study is seen by interviewed stakeholders as being of substantial symbolic value to the policy or programme and has noticeably raised its profile amongst stakeholders	The evaluation study is seen by interviewed stakeholders as being of critical symbolic value to the policy or programme and significantly raised its profile amongst stakeholders inside and outside of government
42			The evaluation study is of conceptual value in understanding what has happened and possibly in shaping future policy and practice	8	1.4 Alignment to policy context and background literature	5.1	The evaluation study is not of conceptual value in understanding what has happened and shaping policy and practice	The evaluation study is of limited conceptual value in understanding what has happened	The evaluation study is of conceptual value in understanding what has happened and possibly in shaping policy and practice	The evaluation study is of conceptual value in understanding what has happened and some interviewed stakeholders indicated the likelihood of it constructively shaping policy and practice	The evaluation study is of great conceptual value and all interviewed stakeholders expressed confidence that it would constructively shape policy and practice

Y