



LEAP

***Learning through Evaluation
with Accountability and Planning***

Evaluation Report Review Tool and Guidelines
2nd Edition

World Vision International
LEAP Team

LEAP Evaluation Report Review Tool
Published November, 2008
© World Vision International, LEAP Team
Send comments or questions to: LEAP@wvi.org

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Affirmation.....	2
Glossary	3
Introduction	3
Evaluation Report Review Tool	4

Acknowledgements

The following parties contributed to the 2nd Edition of this document:

The members of the LEAP Template Kit Review Working Group, Remedios Galdes (APRO), Ratu Saha (APRO), Jacktone Akelo (WV Kenya), Andrew Newmach (WV Australia), Gisela Poole (WV Germany), JSJ Sujeevandas (WV Vietnam), Paula David (WV Canada), Challa Getachew (WV Pakistan), Clare Seddon, and Roscel Mariano-Diego (WV Australia) for the gender editing of all the documents.

The Support Office LEAP Consortium, especially Gisela Poole (WVG), Andrew Newmarch (WVA), and Ari Uotila (WVC).

The LEAP Strategy and Working Group, especially Frank Cookingham; Terrence Jentzi and Randini Wanduragala, external consultants.

The LEAP Team.

Affirmation

Except as acknowledged by the references in this paper to other authors and publications, the template and guidelines described herein consists of our own work, undertaken to improve the quality of World Vision’s Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Learning System.

Lydia Ledgerwood-Eberlein and Laura del Valle, Coordinators — LEAP Research and Development Associates
November, 2008

Glossary

ADP	Area Development Programme
DeRT	Development Resources Team
DfID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DME	Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation
HEA	Humanitarian and Emergency Affairs
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
LCP	Local Capacities for Peace
LEAP	Learning through Evaluation with Accountability and Planning
MSTC	Making Sense of Turbulent Contexts
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NO	National Office
PESTLE	Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Legal, Environmental
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SO	Support Office
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TD	Transformational Development
TOR	Terms of Reference
WV	World Vision

Introduction

This tool is not to be mistaken for a resource for Support Offices to “judge” management reports. In the spirit of LEAP and in the changing environment of World Vision (facilitated by the Our Futures process), this review tool is meant to guide any staff member — Support Office Programme Officers, Regional Quality Specialists, National Office Programme Officers, ADP managers, and the report writers themselves — in improving the quality of the reports generated about our programmes and projects. The process should be one that facilitates discussion between the office generating the report and the people reviewing it. It does not provide definitive answers to what a good report is and what it is not. Rather, it provides suggestions to reviewer and report writer alike as to how to continually improve our documents, products and, ultimately, the impact of our work.

Before using the evaluation report review tool, the reviewer should:

- a) Read the guidelines for completing the evaluation report document and be familiar with the information referenced by those guidelines; and
- b) Do a preliminary read of the submitted evaluation report to determine whether all required sections of the document have been completed.

Evaluation Report Review Tool

I. General Information	
Dates for Evaluation Report:	
• Received	
• Reviewed	
• Feedback Provided	
Name and Title of Reviewer/s	
WV Reviewing Office	
Country	
Programme/ADP/Project Name (including geographical name), If Appropriate	
Evaluation Contact Person	
Tentative Date to Submit the Post-Evaluation Action Plan	

I.1. Strengths of the Evaluation Process and Report
List the strengths of the evaluation process and report.

I.2 Recommendations for Evaluation Report	
Status Categories	Yes or No
• Evaluation Report complete — move to utilisation	
• Evaluation Report requires revisions/additions	
Summary Comments — Outline Recommendations for Evaluation Report	
<p>For example: "Given that the evaluation recommendations were A, B, C..., we suggest that the following process and actions be taken by the ADP management and the National Office during the reflection and redesign stage." This would facilitate transition to the "utilisation" or reflection stage — a stage in which the SOs would also need to participate.</p> <p>Include here recommendations or comments, when appropriate, on the collection and analysis of the data and if/how it could be improved.</p>	

2. Programme/Project Evaluation - Report — Analysis of Content and Quality
2.1 Format
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Is the document formatted according to the LEAP evaluation report format? (ii) Does any comment need to be made on quality of presentation and layout? Have all sections of the report been completed adequately? (iii) Have all appropriate annexes been included?
2.2 Evaluation Introduction/Background
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Is the presentation of the background of the project, its rationale and programme theory and objectives adequate? Is any important information missing? (ii) Consider the time gap between when the data was collected and when the report was written. Is it significant? Reasonable? (iii) Is there evidence of the role and participation of girls, woman, boys, and men as stakeholders?
2.3 Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Does the report summarise the methodology used? (ii) Are the methods adequate for answering the questions in the TOR? (iii) Are the limitations in the methodology described?
2.4 Relevance and Reliability of Data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Is the primary and secondary data collected/selected appropriate? (ii) Was the data sex-disaggregated? (iii) Comment on the extent to which the data collected gives evidence of achievements, lack thereof, and/or unexpected results? (iv) Comment on the reliability of the data and its sufficiency for intended use.
2.5 Strength of Analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Did the report analyse the data in a way that answered the key questions? (ii) Was the analysis strong? If a cause and effect relationship is claimed, have plausible rival explanations been discussed? Is qualitative data illustrated comprehensively? (iii) Did the analysis take into account gender, ethnic group, income and other specifics and relevant issues to the programme and project evaluation objectives?
2.6 Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Do the findings flow logically from and are justified by the data, interpretations, and analyses? (ii) Are additional knowledge, findings/or lessons acknowledged in this evaluation report?
2.7 Conclusions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Do the conclusions clearly reflect the analysis and the findings? Did the report explain how they have been reached? (ii) Are the conclusions stated simply so that the various partner groups can understand them? Are potential sources of bias disclosed and discussed? (iii) Have the questions in the TOR been answered completely and clearly?
2.8 Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Are the recommendations stated simply, so that the various partner groups can understand them? (ii) Can the recommendations be implemented with the resources that are available to the programme? (iii) Is it clear which recommendations flow from the analysis, and which ones are offered by the evaluation team on some other basis (such as their expert knowledge or programme experience)?