

ANHANG

Wirksamkeitsmessung in der internationalen Zusammenarbeit: Metaevaluation DEZA/SECO/AFM

Im Auftrag der Schweizer Parlamentarischen
Verwaltungskontrolle (PVK)

Autoren:

Dr. Stefan Silvestrini (Teamleiter)
Julie Ngo, M.A.

Kontakt:

Dr. Stefan Silvestrini
CEval GmbH
Dudweiler Landstrasse 5
66123 Saarbrücken

Phone +49 681 387539 73
E-Mail s.silvestrini@ceval.de
URL <http://www.ceval.de>

Saarbrücken, 17. April 2023

Inhalt

Inhalt.....	1
7.1 Liste der Evaluationen.....	2
7.2 Analyseraster	5
7.3 Gruppenvergleiche.....	20
7.4 Weitere Korrelationsanalysen	21
7.4.1 Zwischen Qualitätsbewertungen sowie Qualitätsbewertungen und Kosten	21
7.4.2 Qualitätsbewertung und DAC-Erfolgsbewertung.....	25

7.1 Liste der Evaluationen

Ref/No/ID	SECO	Year	Country/ Region
WEHU 167	UNIDO Safe+	2018	Colombia
WEHU 168	Better Work II	2018	Global
WEHU 169	UN Trade Cluster Laos Phase I and II (Exit)	2018	Lao PDR
WEHU 172	GRI CSRCB II	2019	Global
WEHU 173	Fairtrade and FLO Core Funding Programme	2019	Global
WEHU 174	Network Carbon Markets (NCM)	2019	Global
WEHU 175	WTI: Promotion of Human Capacities in Trade Law Policy	2019	PE, VT, ID, ZA, Chile
WEHU 180a	Projet d'Accès aux Marchés des Produits Agro-alimentaires et de Terroir (PAMPAT)	2019	Morocco
WEHU 181	Regional Biotrade Programme	2020	Vietnam, Lao PDR, Myanmar
WEHU 183	Responsible Mining Index, Phase II	2020	Global
WEHU 184	UNIDO Smart Fish	2020	Indonesia
WEHU 186	Colombia & Competitiva	2020	Colombia
WEHU 188	SCORE III	2020	Global
WEHU 189	UN Trade Cluster	2020	Myanmar
WEHU 190	National Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP)	2020	Indonesia
WEIF 106	Promise Impact	2018	Indonesia
WEIF 109	UREEP IFC EE/RE	2018	Ukraine
WEIF 112	Africa Investment Climate Programs with IFC	2019	Sub-Saharan Africa
WEIF 113	EQ-FINREP Albania	2019	Albania
WEIF 114	Facility for Investment Climate Advisory Reform (FIAS)	2019	Global
WEIF 117	Africa Leasing Facility 2	2020	Regional
WEIF 118	Private Sector Competitiveness Program/SWAPP	2020	Ghana
WEIF 120	PROMISE IMPACT	2020	Indonesia
WEIN 53	Capacity Building for Large Gas Infrastructure Developments II (TAP)	2018	Albania
WEMU 92	CIAT Partnership for Strengthening Tax Administrations	2020	LAC
WEIN 56	GIZ Integrated Urban Development Ukraine	2019	Ukraine
WEIN 57	E5P	2019	Ukraine
WEIN 59	Cities Support Programme MDTF WB (CSP)	2019	South Africa
WEIN 62	Integral Development of Urban Water and Sanitation Utilities in Colombia (COMPASS)	2020	Colombia
WEIN 63	ESMAP Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	2020	Global
WEMU 93	Public Financial Management Analytical and Advisory Assistance	2020	Vietnam
WEMU 78	Support to the Financial Sector Regulatory Authority (SBS)	2018	Peru
WEMU 79	Support to the PFM reform process in Colombia	2018	Colombia
WEMU 80	SAI Development Phase I-III	2018	Tajikistan
WEMU 81	PEFA Initiative 2012-2016	2018	Global
WEMU 82	Local Tax Administration Capacity Building (TRAMPIL)	2019	Indonesia
WEMU 83	Extractives Global Programmatic Support Umbrella Trust Fund	2019	Global
WEMU 85	UNCTAD DMFAS	2019	Global
WEMU 86	Moussanada Trust Fund	2019	Tunisia
WEMU 87	Capital Market Strengthening Facility	2020	Global
WEMU 88	IFSSP II	2020	Indonesia
WEMU 89	IMF AFRITAC East	2020	East Africa

Ref/No/ID	AFM	Year	Country/Region
AFM 1	Evaluation de la composante DwP de notre engagement en Colombie	2018	Colombia
AFM 2	Terrestrial Jerusalem	2018	Middle East
AFM 3	Formation justice juvénile au Sénégal	2018	Senegal
AFM 4	Myanmar: Training Course on International Relations	2019	Myanmar

AFM 5	Évaluation d'impact de l'Initiative pour un leadership cohésif (ILC) en République démocratique du Congo, 2012 – 2018	2019	DR Congo
AFM 6	GAAMAC	2019	Global
AFM 7	MSP	2019	Global
AFM 8	APT	2019	Global
AFM 9	UNODC, UNTOC Initiative Trafficking	2019	Global
AFM 10	Conciliation Resources Core Contribution (Strat. Partner)	2020	Global
AFM 11	SSYPADO Core Contribution	2020	South Sudan
AFM 12	International Human Rights and Business	2020	Global

Ref/ No	DEZA	Year	Country/ Region
1.01	Evaluation report of the Promoting Market Oriented Skills Training and Employment programme in the Great Lakes Region phase II	2018	Africa Great Lake Region
1.02	PROYECTO BIOCULTURA Y CAMBIO CLIMÁTICO MISIÓN DE EVALUACIÓN DE MEDIO TERMINO	2018	Bolivia
1.03	Consultoría para realizar el diseño y la ejecución de la evaluación al Proyecto "Ampliación de la capacidad de respuesta de la Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil en el marco de la suscripción del acuerdo final para la terminación del conflicto y la construcción de una paz estable y duradera", cofinanciado por COSUDE	2018	Colombia
1.04	Jinsha River Basin Integrated Water Resources and Risk Management under Changing Climate Project	2018	China/Tibet
1.05	Mid-term Evaluation of the Project Titled "Improving Land Governance in the IGAD Region"	2018	Africa (IGAD Region)
1.06	Evaluation of the GPMD' Migration and Development Engagement on Decent Work in the Middle East, South Asia and Sri Lanka	2018	Middle East, South Asia and Sri Lanka
1.07	Mid-term Assessment Mission SURAFCO III Final Report	2018	Laos
1.08	External Project Review Contribution to improved access to water and sanitation services in Bekaa Valley	2018	Lebanon
1.09	Projet d'Appui aux Communes Urbaines du Mali (PACUM) / Phase I (1.3.2013 – 31.12.2018)	2018	Mali
1.10	RAPPORT D'ÉVALUATION INTERMÉDIAIRE / PAFA / PROGRAMME D'APPUI AUX FILIÈRES AGROPASTORALES DE SIKASSO	2018	Mali
1.11	"Fortalecimiento e Innovación académica-científica en Reducción de Riesgo ante Desastres y Adaptación al Cambio Climático en la Universidad Centroamericana (UCA), año 2013-2017"	2018	Nicaragua
1.12	Seed and Knowledge Initiative End of Phase Evaluation	2018	Southern Africa
1.13	External Review of the Prevention of Domestic Violence project in Tajikistan	2018	Tajikistan
1.14	Revue externe à mi-parcours Programme de soutien au processus électoral en Tunisie- phase 1	2018	Tunisia
1.15	Uzbekistan External Review of SDC's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program Phases I – IV (2007- 2018), with Emphasis on Phase IV (2013 -2018)	2018	Uzbekistan
1.16	External Review: Livestock Development in the South of Armenia Project (Phase 4); Livestock Development South- North Project (Phase 5)	2019	Armenia
1.17	Évaluation de la phase 1 du Programme de contribution au FADeC (2016-2019)	2019	Benin
1.18	Evaluación externa del proyecto Vida sin Violencia (VsV) de la Cooperación Suiza en Bolivia, Fase I	2019	Bolivia
1.19	External Evaluation Report: Project: "Strengthening the Role of Local Communities/Mjesne Zajednice in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015–2019"	2019	Bosnia-Herzegovina
1.20	Evaluation of the Swiss Contribution to the inclusion of Roma and other vulnerable groups "Health and Education for All"	2019	Bulgaria
1.21	Review CapaCITIES project, Phase 1	2019	Other
1.22	Independent Mid-Term Review of the Low Carbon Cement Project (LCC) (Phase 2)	2019	Other
1.23	External Evaluation Report: World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT)	2019	Other
1.24	Evaluación Externa del Programa Fortalecimiento de los Derechos Humanos y a las Auditorías Sociales (FDHAS)	2019	Honduras
1.25	EVALUATION OF THE SOMALIA RESILIENCE PROGRAM (SomRep) 2017-2019	2019	Horn of Africa
1.26	Enhancing Youth Employment Project: final report	2019	Kosovo

1.27	End of project external evaluation: Health Care waste Management with Hospital Acquired Infection Control project in Kyrgyz Hospitals (HCWM/HAI)	2019	Kyrgyzstan
1.28	Appui Suisse aux Associations Professionnelles au Maroc”, Phase II - Evaluation finale du projet	2019	Morocco
1.29	Vocational Skills Development Program Myanmar - Report on the Mid-term Review	2019	Myanmar
1.30	Evaluation of the Swiss Contribution to the inclusion of Roma and other vulnerable groups "Reform Fund linked to the Roma Inclusion and other Vulnerable Groups"	2019	Romania
1.31	Mid-Term Review 2019: R4 Rural Resilience Initiative in Southern Africa (Phase II)	2019	Southern Africa
1.32	Independent review of RisiAlbania - Phase 2	2020	Albania
1.33	Mid Term Review of the project “Modernisation Vocational Education and Training programme” in Croatia	2020	Croatia
1.34	End of Project Evaluation of the project “Postharvest Management in Sub-Saharan Africa” - Final Report	2020	Mozambique/Benin
1.35	Mid-Term Review of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation Strengthening Land Governance in Myanmar Project - Final Report	2020	Myanmar
1.36	SDC/HA Emergency Cash Pilot For Earthquake Affected Households in Bubq, Albania - Final Report	2020	Albania
1.37	Mid-Term Review WaSH Support for Rohingya Refugees and Vulnerable Local Communities in Cox's Bazar District	2020	Bangladesh
1.38	Independent Terminal Evaluation - INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN UPPER EGYPT (SOHAG) – PHASE 2 (HAYAT)	2020	Egypt
1.39	Post-Harvest Management in Sub-Saharan Africa – FAO/IFAD/WFP End of Project Evaluation - Final Report	2020	Burkina Faso, Uganda, DR Congo
1.40	External Review of the project Safe Resources Recovery and Reuse (RRR) - Final Report	2020	Peru, Uganda
1.41	EXTERNAL EVALUATION of the initiative "El Agua nos une - SuizaAgua" 2016-2020	2020	Latin America
1.42	Evaluation Report of the Durable Solutions Initiative in Somalia	2020	Somalia
1.43	REVUE EXTERNE INTERMÉDIAIRE DES PROJETS - "RENFORCEMENT DES MOYENS TUNISIENS ÉTATIQUES ET NON-ÉTATIQUES DE RÉPONSE AUX URGENCES HUMAINITAIRES LIÉES À LA MIGRATION"	2020	Tunisia
1.44	Revue externe à mi-parcours - Projets de la Coopération suisse en Tunisie en matière de prévention de l'extrémisme violent (PEV)	2020	Tunisia
1.45	VALORACIÓN DEL PROGRESO DEL PROYECTO: FONDO DE AYUDA FINANCIERA A TERCEROS (FAFT) DE AYUDA EN ACCIÓN, NICARAGUA	2020	Nicaragua, Costa Rica
1.46	Informe de evaluación del proyecto: “Derechos e integración: respuesta a la crisis migratoria de la población nicaragüense refugiada y solicitante de refugio en Costa Rica”	2020	Costa Rica
1.47	FINAL EVALUATION OF THE SEEDS AND MARKETS PROJECT (ESWATINI, LESOTHO AND ZIMBABWE) - Final Report	2020	Eswatini, Lesotho, Zimbabwe
1.48	EVALUACIÓN DE MEDIO TÉRMINO PROYECTO “MERCADOS INCLUSIVOS”	2020	Bolivia

7.2 Analyseraster

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
1.	Terms of Reference			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\frac{\sum(1.1 - 1.8)}{8}$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
1.1		Context of the development intervention/evaluation is adequately described		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\frac{\sum(1.1.1 - 1.1.4)}{4}$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.1.1			A context analysis is provided in the ToR.	no (0), yes (1)	Dedicated chapter or at least paragraph outlining the current situation of the intervention area, its development, most important factors.
1.1.2			In the context analysis it is referred to Swiss development policies or strategies.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least.
1.1.3			In the context analysis it is referred to international, national or regional policies/ strategies & context.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least.
1.1.4			Overall, the context description adequately relates to the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least that outline how the intervention relates to its overall implementation context, SDC and further international, national or regional policies/ strategies & contexts.
1.2		Evaluation object (The key elements of the evaluation object are adequately described)		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\frac{\sum(1.2.1 - 1.2.9)}{9}$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
1.2.1			The description of the intervention includes time period.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. start and end dates of intervention are mentioned.
1.2.2			The description of the intervention includes budget.	no (0), yes (1)	At least total budget of intervention is mentioned.
1.2.3			The description of the intervention includes intervention area.	no (0), yes (1)	Description where exactly the intervention takes places in the country/region.
1.2.4			The description of the intervention includes components of the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	Different components of the intervention are described; this may also refer to different sub-projects or -programmes (e.g. within a region, sector)

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
					covered by the evaluation. If the intervention is not structured into components then give it a 1.
1.2.5			The description of the intervention includes target groups and further stakeholders of the project.	no (0), yes (1)	Description of who is going to benefit in which way from the intervention.
1.2.6			The description of the intervention includes objectives of the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	Description of what is expected to be achieved by the intervention (intended results).
1.2.7			The description of the intervention includes implementation arrangements (incl. organisational set-up).	no (0), yes (1)	Description of partners who are involved in the project/program and their labour division.
1.2.8			The current state of the intervention is adequately described.	no (0), yes (1)	i.e. if it is about to be started (baseline), in progress (mid-term), about to be or just completed (final) or already terminated for some time (ex-post, at least 6 months).
1.2.9			The intervention logic or results model of the evaluation object is described.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. LogFrame, visualization of results chain or model, narrative description of the project's Theory of Change.
1.3		Rationale and purpose		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.3.1 - 1.3.5)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.3.1			The ToR contains a description of the goals of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Evaluation goals such as generation of findings/evidence, (institutional) learning, controlling, providing accountability.
1.3.2			... of the rationale for evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Reasons are provided, why the evaluation is implemented (e.g. end of project term, required by funding agency).
1.3.3			... of the intended user(s)/addresses of evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Organizations/divisions/persons are described that will use the results of the evaluation.
1.3.4			... of the intended use of evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Intended use of the evaluation results (e.g. decision making, continuation of project, design of follow-on project).
1.4		Scope of the evaluation		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.4.1 - 1.4.3)/3$ (1) = 0 (2) = 0,33 (3) = 0,67 (4) = 1

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
1.4.1			The intervention components to be covered by the evaluation are mentioned or it is mentioned that the entire intervention is subject to the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Components may e.g. refer to activities implemented in a certain sector, for a specific target group with a particular instrument (e.g. Capacity Development/Training, infrastructure support). If the intervention is not structured into components then give it a 1.
1.4.2			The temporal delineation of the evaluation is mentioned.	no (0), yes (1)	Period of the intervention's implementation that is covered by the evaluation is specified.
1.4.3			The geographic areas covered by the evaluation are mentioned.	no (0), yes (1)	Geographic areas covered or focused on during evaluation are mentioned. If the intervention is not differentiated in geographical areas then give it a 1.
1.5		Evaluation criteria/questions		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.6.1 - 1.6.5)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.5.1			The ToR define criteria according to which the evaluation findings should be structured.	no (0), yes (1)	Criteria can be e.g. OECD/DAC criteria, ALNAP criteria, SDGs or structured according to the IOOI logic.
1.5.2			The ToR specify cross-cutting issues to be addressed by the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Cross cutting issues can be e.g. gender equality, climate change adaptation Do-No-Harm etc.
1.5.3			The ToR contain adequate evaluation questions. The evaluation questions are sufficiently specific.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. a list, bullet-points specifically referred to as evaluation questions.
1.5.4			The number of evaluation questions amounts between 5 and 15.	no (0), yes (1)	If no evaluation questions are mentioned give it a 0, however if it is mentioned that the evaluators should formulate evaluation questions, give it a 1.
1.6		Requested evaluation methodology		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.7.1 - 1.7.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.6.1			The ToR contain specifications on the envisaged methodology of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 1-2 sentences on data collection (e.g. survey, interviews, FGDs, observations) and analysis (e.g. qualitative content analysis, Grounded Theory, uni-, bi- or multivariate descriptive or inferential statistics) methods.
1.6.2			Request for mix of qualitative and quantitative methods.	no (0), yes (1)	At least one sentence that stipulates the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods.

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
1.6.3			Request for triangulation.	no (0), yes (1)	At least one sentence that stipulates data/source, method, results or researcher triangulation.
1.6.4			Specification of data sources.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 1-2 sentences what data should be collected (e.g. target groups, project reports, partner monitoring)
1.7		Responsibilities, deliverables and schedule of the evaluation		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.8.1 - 1.8.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.7.1			The ToR specify the roles and responsibilities of commissioner(s) and evaluator(s).	no (0), yes (1)	Any information about roles and responsibilities of commissioners AND evaluator(s)
1.7.2			The ToR outline the desired deliverables of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Table or paragraph specifying the deliverables such as data collection instruments, Inception Report, draft Evaluation Report, results presentation.
1.7.3			The ToR specify the overall deadline for the completion of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	End-date when the final report should be completed.
1.7.4			The ToR specify envisaged milestones with a corresponding timeline.	no (0), yes (1)	Table or paragraph specifying the timeline with milestones (i.e. deliverables, workshops)
1.8		<i>Feasibility (Scope of work and given timeframe and resources are feasible.) / The evaluation is planned and implemented in a realistic, diplomatic and cost efficient manner.</i>		<i>inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)</i>	$\sum(1.9.1 - 1.9.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
1.8.1			<i>Evaluation budget in ToR</i>	<i>no (0), yes (1)</i>	<i>Maximum budget or the total number of working days for the evaluation is specified.</i>
1.8.2			<i>Feasibility of the evaluation given the budget.</i>	<i>no (0), yes (1)</i>	<i>Expert assessment, based on general figures for specific evaluation designs:</i> - <i>ex-post facto design evaluation of a simple project: 20-40 t€</i> - <i>ex-post facto design evaluation of a complex project: 30-60 t€</i> - <i>sophisticated (e.g. time-series, group comparison) design evaluation of a simple project: 50-80 t€</i> - <i>sophisticated design evaluation of a complex</i>

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
					project: 60-120 t€ - RIE (RCT, quasi-experimental) design evaluation of a of a simple project: 150-300 t€ - RIE design evaluation of a complex project: >250 T€ If ToR do not contain requested design/methodology and/or budget then enter 0.
1.8.3			Feasibility of the evaluation given the available time.	no (0), yes (1)	Comparison of available time with expected evaluation design and methodology. If ToR do not contain requested design/methodology and/or budget then enter 0.
2.	Executive summary			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(2.1 - 2.2)/2$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
2.1		Content, completeness: rationale/purpose/objectives of evaluation, description of intervention, scope of evaluation, evaluation design and methodology, main findings, conclusions and recommendations		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(2.1.1 - 2.1.10)/10$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
2.1.1			Summary describes rationale/purpose of evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Reasons are provided, why the evaluation is implemented (e.g. end of project term, required by funding agency).
2.1.2			Summary describes goals of evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Evaluation goals such as generation of findings/evidence, (institutional) learning, controlling, providing accountability.
2.1.3			Summary describes the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	A paragraph at least.
2.1.4			Summary describes the scope of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least about the temporal and geographical delineation of the evaluation.
2.1.5			Summary describes the evaluation design.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least.
2.1.6			Summary describes the methods.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 1-2 sentences on data collection (e.g. survey, interviews, FGDs, observations) and analysis (e.g. qualitative content analysis, Grounded Theory, uni-, bi- or multivariate descriptive or inferential statistics) methods.

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
2.1.7			Summary describes the findings.	no (0), yes (1)	A set of paragraphs according to the evaluation criteria/analytical dimensions
2.1.8			Summary describes the conclusions.	no (0), yes (1)	One paragraph at least.
2.1.9			Summary describes recommendations.	no (0), yes (1)	One paragraph at least.
2.1.10			Summary describes lessons learnt.	no (0), yes (1)	One paragraph at least.
2.2		Style: length, readability, consistency		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(2.2.1 - 2.2.2)/2$ (1) = 0 (2) = 0,50 (3) = n.a. (4) = 1
2.2.1			Summary is written in clear language.	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment. Guidance: Do you understand what has been evaluated, why and how and what the main findings, conclusions and recommendations are?
2.2.2			Summary is consistent with report.	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment, to be done in the end in comparing the ES with the main body of the report. Important: The ES must not contain any new information that is not covered in the report elsewhere.
3.	Introduction & context analysis			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(3.1 - 3.3)/3$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
3.1		Rationale and purpose		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(3.1.1 - 3.1.5)/5$ (1) = 0-0,2 (2) = 0,4-0,6 (3) = 0,8 (4) = 1
3.1.1			The introduction contains a description of the goals of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Evaluation goals such as generation of findings/evidence, (institutional) learning, controlling, providing accountability.
3.1.2			... of the rationale for evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Reasons are provided, why the evaluation is implemented (e.g. end of project term, required by funding agency).
3.1.3			... of the intended user(s)/addresses of evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	Organizations/divisions/persons are described that will use the results of the evaluation.

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
3.1.4			... of the intended use of evaluation	no (0), yes (1)	Intended use of the evaluation results (e.g. decision making, continuation of project, design of follow-on project).
3.1.5			The evaluation criteria/ questions are mentioned.	no (0), yes (1)	Compare with list of criteria/ EQ in ToR. If no criteria/ EQ are mentioned in the ToR then give it a 0.
3.2		Context analysis		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(3.2.1 - 3.2.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
3.2.1			A context analysis is provided in the introduction.	no (0), yes (1)	Dedicated chapter or at least paragraph outlining the current situation of the intervention area, its development, most important factors.
3.2.2			In the context analysis it is referred to Swiss development policies or strategies.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least.
3.2.3			In the context analysis it is referred to international, national or regional policies/ strategies & context.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least.
3.2.4			Overall, the context description adequately relates to the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	1-2 sentences at least that outline how the intervention relates to its overall implementation context, SDC and further international, national or regional policies/ strategies & contexts.
3.3		Evaluation object (The key elements of the evaluation object are adequately described)		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(1.2.1 - 1.2.9)/9$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
3.3.1			The description of the intervention includes time period.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. start and end date of intervention are mentioned.
3.3.2			The description of the intervention includes budget.	no (0), yes (1)	At least total budget of intervention is mentioned.
3.3.3			The description of the intervention includes intervention area.	no (0), yes (1)	Description where exactly the intervention takes places in the country/region.
3.3.4			The description of the intervention includes components of the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	Different components of the intervention are described; this may also refer to different sub-projects or -programmes (e.g. within a region, sector) covered by the evaluation. If the intervention is not structured into components then give it a 1.

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
3.3.5			The description of the intervention includes target groups and further stakeholders of the project.	no (0), yes (1)	Description of who is going to benefit in which way from the intervention.
3.3.6			The description of the intervention includes objectives of the intervention.	no (0), yes (1)	Description of what is expected to be achieved by the intervention (intended results).
3.3.7			The description of the intervention includes implementation arrangements (incl. organisational set-up).	no (0), yes (1)	Description of partners who are involved in the project/program and their labour division.
3.3.8			The current state of the intervention is adequately described.	no (0), yes (1)	i.e. if it is about to be started (baseline), in progress (mid-term), about to be or just completed (final) or already terminated for some time (ex-post, at least 6 months).
3.3.9			The intervention logic or results model of the evaluation object is described.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. LogFrame, visualization of results chain or model, narrative description of the project's Theory of Change.
4.	Evaluation methodology			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.1 - 4.6)/6$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
4.1		Evaluation design		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.1.1 - 4.1.3)/4$ (1) = 0 (2) = 0,33 (3) = 0,67 (4) = 1
4.1.1			The evaluation design is described.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. ex-post facto, RCT, experimental, quasi-experimental, DiD, RDD, single-difference, longitudinal/time-series.
4.1.2			A attribution or contribution analysis is undertaken.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. data from at least two groups (i.e. target/treatment and comparison group) OR data from at least two points in time is compared (e.g. baseline, mid-term, endline) OR any other comparison has been applied.
4.1.3			The evaluation design is adequate in view of the project design	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment: Comparison of the description of the evaluation design with the project design (e.g. in an RCT if participants were selected at random or RDD if participant selection is based on certain criteria).
4.1.4			Evaluation matrix (analysis grid) presented	no (0), yes (1)	often in the Annex

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
4.2		Sources of evidence		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.2.1 - 4.2.8)/8$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
4.2.1			The sources of information are described.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 2-3 sentences about the data sources (e.g. target groups, project report, partner monitoring) that were used for the evaluation.
4.2.2			Project documents are used in the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. project proposals, progress reports, publications, info material. Look in the annex.
4.2.3			M&E data are used in the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. from a results-based monitoring system or previous evaluations if available. If mentioned that not available then give it a 1. Look in the annex.
4.2.4			The implementing organisation(s) are used as source of information for the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. technical officers, project managers.
4.2.5			The beneficiaries are used as source of information of the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. project target groups, participants.
4.2.6			The institutional environment are used as source of information in the evaluation.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. external experts, (N)Gos.
4.2.7			Other data source(s) are used	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. national statistics, sector reviews, studies on the intervention area.
4.2.8			The mix of data sources is appropriate.	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment: At least three out of the five data sources mentioned under 4.2.2 to 4.2.7 are used. Data sources comprise all relevant stakeholders' perspectives.
4.3		Data collection		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.3.1 - 4.3.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
4.3.1			Data collection instruments are described in the report.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. interviews, FGDs, observations, surveys.
4.3.2			Qualitative and quantitative data was collected.	no (0), yes (1)	...
4.3.3			Data collection instruments are apparently applied without severe failures.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. FGDs with too many participants.
4.3.4			Data validity and reliability is being discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	At least one paragraph, incl. reference to internal vs. external validity.

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
4.4		Sampling		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.4.1 - 4.4.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
4.4.1			The report contains information on the sample.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. how many persons are interviewed or surveyed.
4.4.2			The sampling strategy is described.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. if it was a random, stratified random, purposive or convenient sampling.
4.4.3			The evaluators justify the sampling strategy.	no (0), yes (1)	Reasons for the sampling strategy are described (e.g. aiming at statistical representativeness, logistical considerations, budget restrictions).
4.4.4			The sampling strategy is adequate.	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment: In view of the size of the total population, considering statements made in the results section, postulated external validity.
4.5		Data analysis		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(3.5.1 - 3.5.5)/5$ (1) = 0-0,2 (2) = 0,4-0,6 (3) = 0,8 (4) = 1
4.5.1			Data analysis methods are described.	no (0), yes (1)	At least one paragraph, incl. reference to concrete analysis methods (e.g. qualitative content analysis, t-tests, correlations, regressions) and, if applicable, software (e.g. SPSS, STATA, MaxQDA) applied.
4.5.2			Qualitative data analysis methods are used.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. qualitative content analysis, grounded theory, discourse analysis.
4.5.3			Quantitative data analysis methods are used.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. descriptive statistics, inferential statistics.
4.5.4			The mix of data analysis methods is appropriate.	no (0), yes (1)	Expert assessment in view of the evaluation object and the demands regarding internal and external validity as formulated in the ToR.
4.5.5			Data analysis methods are applied without severe failures.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. ignoring basic statistics like mixing up pure numbers and causal effects, interpreting ordinal scaled variables metrically, generalizing based on single interviews etc.
4.6		Limitations and challenges		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(4.6.1 - 4.6.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
					(3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
4.6.1			Practical limitations and/or challenges encountered during the evaluation are described.	no (0), yes (1)	At least one paragraph (e.g. travel restrictions, security situation, practical constraints).
4.6.2			Limitations regarding data collection are described.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 1-2 sentences (e.g. traceability/accessibility of respondents, low return-rates).
4.6.3			Limitations regarding data management and analysis methods are described.	no (0), yes (1)	At least 1-2 sentences (e.g. biasedness of data, data gaps, data quality/ cleaning).
4.6.4			Coping strategies for limitations are described.	no (0), yes (1)	If applicable, at least 1-2 sentences describing strategies for dealing with limitations (e.g. caveats). If not applicable then give it a 1.
5.	Evaluation findings			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.1 - 5.7)/7$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
5.1		Strength of evidence		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.1.1 - 5.1.5)/5$ (1) = 0-0,2 (2) = 0,4-0,6 (3) = 0,8 (4) = 1
5.1.1			Findings are evidence-based.	no (0), yes (1)	In presenting the findings it is frequently referred to the collected data.
5.1.2			Findings are put into perspective with reference to different data sources.	no (0), yes (1)	E.g. interviews showed xx but the focus groups came to different results. Or in the survey respondents showed xx which was confirmed by the interviews.
5.1.3			Findings are clearly separated from conclusions and recommendations.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. findings chapter contains mainly findings while conclusions and recommendations chapter does not contain any (new) findings.
5.1.4			Attribution of intervention to observed changes/ results or its contribution to them is adequately discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. causal relations between intervention and observed changes/ results are explored under consideration of alternative (confounding) factors
5.1.5			Results presentation following evaluation matrix (analysis grid)	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. if the results presentation follows the structure of the analysis grid; check annex
5.2		Relevance		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.2.1 - 4.2.7)/7$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
					(3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
5.2.1			Relevance is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's relevance.
5.2.2			The intervention's consistency with target group(s)/ final beneficiaries needs are discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention meets the needs of the target group(s)/ final beneficiaries (e.g. improvement of livelihood situation, of institutional capacities)?
5.2.3			The intervention's consistency with partner government/regional policies is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is consistent and supportive of the partner government/regional policies?
5.2.4			The intervention's consistency with the SECO/AFM development cooperation policy is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is consistent with the SECO/AFM development cooperation policy?
5.2.5			It is discussed if the intervention addresses international, regional and/ or national conventions, policies, strategies or goals.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is addressing international conventions, policies, strategies or goals (e.g. SDGs)?
5.2.6			The appropriateness of the intervention's design is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention's design is appropriate?
5.2.7			The adaptation of the intervention to changing context conditions is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention has been adapted to context changes to remain relevant?
5.3		Coherence		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.3.1 - 5.3.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
5.3.1			Coherence is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's coherence.
5.3.2			The internal coherence of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is coherent with other intervention by SECO/AFM?/ If it is synergic to and interlinked with other interventions carried out by SECO/AFM ?
5.3.3			The external coherence of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is the intervention consistent with other actors' interventions in the same context (i.e. complementarity, co-ordination with others, adding value while avoiding duplication of effort)?

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
5.3.4			The intervention coordination with other donor's activities is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is coordinated with other donor's activities (i.e. avoiding duplication)
5.4		Effectiveness		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.4.1 - 5.4.5)/5$ (1) = 0-0,2 (2) = 0,4-0,6 (3) = 0,8 (4) = 1
5.4.1			Effectiveness is discussed	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's effectiveness.
5.4.2			The output achievement of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the outputs of the intervention have been achieved?
5.4.3			The outcome achievement of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the outcomes of the intervention have been achieved?
5.4.4			The intervention's contribution to observed changes at outcome level is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, to what extent the intervention has contributed to the observed changes at outcome level (e.g. improved income of target group)?
5.4.5			Outcomes are disaggregated according to specific groups.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if results at outcome level are differentiated across groups (e.g. gender, age groups, most vulnerable)
5.5		Impact		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.5.1 - 5.5.5)/5$ (1) = 0-0,2 (2) = 0,4-0,6 (3) = 0,8 (4) = 1
5.5.1			Impact is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's impact.
5.5.2			The impact achievement of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the impacts of the intervention have been achieved?
5.5.3			The intervention's contribution to observed changes at impact level is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention contributed to its overall objective, reach its intended impact?
5.5.4			Impacts are disaggregated according to specific groups.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss differential impacts across groups (e.g. by gender, age groups, different target groups like persons with disabilities)?
5.5.5			Unintended impacts are discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention has any unintended impacts?

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
5.6		Efficiency		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.6.1 - 5.6.6)/6$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
5.6.1			Efficiency is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's efficiency.
5.6.2			The timeliness of the intervention's implementation is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the implementation of the intervention is/was on time?
5.6.3			The production efficiency of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the inputs have been converted into high quality outputs?
5.6.4			The allocation efficiency of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the inputs have been converted into high quality outcomes?
5.6.5			The cost efficiency of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the intervention is efficient regarding costs?
5.6.6			The management efficiency of the intervention is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the implementation management is efficient?
5.7		Sustainability		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\sum(5.7.1 - 5.7.6)/6$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
5.7.1			Sustainability is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	I.e. the report contains a chapter on the intervention's sustainability.
5.7.2			Does the report discuss the sustainability as a multifaceted concept?	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss the sustainability as a multifaceted concept? I.e. does it discuss the economic, social and environmental sustainability of the intervention?
5.7.3			The likeliness of the continuation of the intervention's benefits is discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss if the benefits of the intervention are likely to continue after the completion of the intervention? I.e. Do the final beneficiaries further benefit after the intervention ends?
5.7.4			The capacities of the partners/ target groups/ beneficiaries to benefit sustainably from the intervention's results are discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if the partners/ target groups/ beneficiaries have the technical, financial and human capacities to benefit sustainably from the intervention's results?
5.7.5			The risks to the sustainability of the intervention's results are discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, if risks threatening the sustainability of the intervention?

Code	Hauptkriterium	Teilkriterium	Indikator	Bewertungsstufen	Auswertungsregel
5.7.6			The intervention's strategies to mitigate the risks to the sustainability of its results are discussed.	no (0), yes (1)	Does the report discuss, what has been done to mitigate the risks threatening the sustainability of its results (e.g. exit strategy, follow-up activities/projects)?
6.	Conclusions and recommendations			inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\Sigma(6.1 - 6.2)/2$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,26-0,50 (3) = 0,51-0,75 (4) = 0,76-1
6.1		Reference to findings		no (0), yes (1)	$\Sigma(6.1.1 - 6.1.3)/2$ (1) = 0 (2) = 0,33 (3) = 0,67 (4) = 1
6.1.1			Conclusions are logically connected and derived from evaluation findings.	no (0), yes (1)	
6.1.2			Recommendations are firmly based on findings and/or conclusions.	no (0), yes (1)	
6.2		Addressing and prioritization of recommendations		inadequate (1), need for improvement (2), satisfactory (3), good or very good (4)	$\Sigma(6.2.1 - 6.2.4)/4$ (1) = 0-0,25 (2) = 0,50 (3) = 0,75 (4) = 1
6.2.1			Recommendations are directed to actors.	no (0), yes (1)	
6.2.2			Recommendations are prioritised.	no (0), yes (1)	
6.2.3			Recommendations are time-bound.	no (0), yes (1)	
6.2.4			Lessons learned are presented.	no (0), yes (1)	

7.3 Gruppenvergleiche

SECO

		Terms of Reference	Executive summary	Introduction and context analysis	Evaluation methodology	Evaluation findings	Conclusions and recommendations	Costs of the evaluation (CHF)
N	Gültig	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
	Fehlend	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Median		0,55902778	0,72500000	0,49259259	0,25000000	0,49727891	0,62500000	38000,00
Perzentile	25	0,44097222	0,63750000	0,40185185	0,18750000	0,42261905	0,50000000	28117,53
	50	0,55902778	0,72500000	0,49259259	0,25000000	0,49727891	0,62500000	38000,00
	75	0,61458333	0,80000000	0,65324074	0,40312500	0,58341837	0,75000000	50885,00
Interquartilsabstand		0,17361111	0,16250000	0,25138889	0,21562500	0,16079932	0,25000000	22767,47

AFM

		Terms of Reference	Executive summary	Introduction and context analysis	Evaluation methodology	Evaluation findings	Conclusions and recommendations	Costs of the evaluation (CHF)
N	Gültig	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
	Fehlend	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Median		0,51041667	0,67500000	0,41018519	0,35416667	0,44472789	0,62500000	18337,00
Perzentile	25	0,42621528	0,42500000	0,26712963	0,24583333	0,34319728	0,28125000	16861,75
	50	0,51041667	0,67500000	0,41018519	0,35416667	0,44472789	0,62500000	18337,00
	75	0,56250000	0,70000000	0,50046296	0,44791667	0,49319728	0,62500000	27351,75
Interquartilsabstand		0,13628472	0,27500000	0,23333333	0,20208333	0,15000000	0,34375000	10490,00

DEZA

		Terms of Reference	Executive summary	Introduction and context analysis	Evaluation methodology	Evaluation findings	Conclusions and recommendations	Costs of the evaluation (CHF)
N	Gültig	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
	Fehlend	34	0	0	0	0	0	0
Median		0,63715278	0,70000000	0,51296296	0,32500000	0,50306122	0,62500000	34083,72
Perzentile	25	0,56597222	0,55000000	0,34537037	0,17291667	0,37950680	0,50000000	24575,00
	50	0,63715278	0,70000000	0,51296296	0,32500000	0,50306122	0,62500000	34083,72
	75	0,68576389	0,83750000	0,60833333	0,51145833	0,62585034	0,75000000	54725,00
Interquartilsabstand		0,11979167	0,28750000	0,26296296	0,33854167	0,24634354	0,25000000	30150,00

7.4 Weitere Korrelationsanalysen

7.4.1 Zwischen Qualitätsbewertungen sowie Qualitätsbewertungen und Kosten

Legende

Pearson-Korrelation: Der Pearson-Korrelationskoeffizient gibt an, wie stark eine lineare Beziehung zwischen zwei Variablen ist, also wie sehr sich der Wert der einen Variable ändert, wenn sich der Wert der anderen ändert. Er kann Werte zwischen -1 (perfekte negative Korrelation, d.h. der Wert der einen Variable steigt, wenn der der anderen fällt und umgekehrt) und +1 (perfekte positive Korrelation, d.h. beide Variablen verändern ihre Werte gleichermassen) annehmen. Bei einem Wert von < 0,1 wird üblicherweise kein Zusammenhang vermutet, bei einem Wert zwischen $\geq 0,1$ und < 0,3 ein schwacher Zusammenhang, zwischen $\geq 0,3$ und < 0,5 ein mässiger Zusammenhang und bei einem Wert $\geq 0,5$ ein starker Zusammenhang.

p-Wert: Der p-Wert gibt an, mit welcher Wahrscheinlichkeit der Korrelationskoeffizient zufällig von „0“ abweicht. D.h. je geringer dieser Wert, desto wahrscheinlicher ist es, dass der Koeffizient eine tatsächliche Beziehung der korrelierten Variablen anzeigt. Im Allgemeinen werden Werte < 0,01 als hoch signifikant, < 0,05 als signifikant und $\geq 0,05$ als nicht signifikant bezeichnet.

N: Anzahl der Fälle der Berechnung der Korrelation zugrundeliegt, d.h. bei denen für beide Variablen ein gültiger Wert vorliegt.

Gesamtstichprobe

		Leistungs- beschreibung	Executive Summary	Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Methodik	Ergebnis- darstellung	Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Evaluations- kosten
Leistungsbeschreibung	Pearson-Korrelation	1	0,172	,339**	,445**	,396**	0,142	0,053
	p-Wert		0,130	0,002	0,000	0,000	0,211	0,645
	N	79	79	79	79	79	79	78
Executive Summary	Pearson-Korrelation	0,172	1	0,083	,189*	0,161	0,163	0,157
	p-Wert	0,130		0,380	0,044	0,088	0,084	0,096
	N	79	114	114	114	114	114	113
Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Pearson-Korrelation	,339**	0,083	1	,208*	,222*	,219*	-0,038
	p-Wert	0,002	0,380		0,027	0,018	0,019	0,687
	N	79	114	114	114	114	114	113
Methodik	Pearson-Korrelation	,445**	,189*	,208*	1	,493**	,251**	0,162
	p-Wert	0,000	0,044	0,027		0,000	0,007	0,087
	N	79	114	114	114	114	114	113
Ergebnisdarstellung	Pearson-Korrelation	,396**	0,161	,222*	,493**	1	,305**	0,070
	p-Wert	0,000	0,088	0,018	0,000		0,001	0,463
	N	79	114	114	114	114	114	113
Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Pearson-Korrelation	0,142	0,163	,219*	,251**	,305**	1	0,055
	p-Wert	0,211	0,084	0,019	0,007	0,001		0,566
	N	79	114	114	114	114	114	113

Evaluationskosten	Pearson-Korrelation	0,053	0,157	-0,038	0,162	0,070	0,055	1
	p-Wert	0,645	0,096	0,687	0,087	0,463	0,566	
	N	78	113	113	113	113	113	113

** . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.

* . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

SECO

		Leistungs- beschreibung	Executive Summary	Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Methodik	Ergebnis- darstellung	Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Evaluations- kosten
Leistungsbeschreibung	Pearson-Korrelation	1	0,269	,472**	,310*	0,281	0,158	0,085
	p-Wert		0,089	0,002	0,048	0,075	0,323	0,603
	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	40
Executive Summary	Pearson-Korrelation	0,269	1	0,209	0,202	0,293	,348*	0,173
	p-Wert	0,089		0,185	0,198	0,059	0,024	0,279
	N	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Pearson-Korrelation	,472**	0,209	1	0,182	0,216	,423**	-0,109
	p-Wert	0,002	0,185		0,247	0,169	0,005	0,496
	N	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
Methodik	Pearson-Korrelation	,310*	0,202	0,182	1	,331*	0,232	,453**
	p-Wert	0,048	0,198	0,247		0,033	0,139	0,003
	N	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
Ergebnisdarstellung	Pearson-Korrelation	0,281	0,293	0,216	,331*	1	,395**	0,242
	p-Wert	0,075	0,059	0,169	0,033		0,010	0,128
	N	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Pearson-Korrelation	0,158	,348*	,423**	0,232	,395**	1	0,024
	p-Wert	0,323	0,024	0,005	0,139	0,010		0,882
	N	41	42	42	42	42	42	41
Evaluationskosten	Pearson-Korrelation	0,085	0,173	-0,109	,453**	0,242	0,024	1
	p-Wert	0,603	0,279	0,496	0,003	0,128	0,882	
	N	40	41	41	41	41	41	41

** . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.

* . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

AFM

		Leistungs- beschreibung	Executive Summary	Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Methodik	Ergebnis- darstellung	Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Evaluations- kosten
Leistungsbeschreibung	Pearson-Korrelation	1	0,007	0,099	0,051	0,105	-0,241	0,086
	p-Wert		0,983	0,760	0,874	0,745	0,451	0,791
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Executive Summary	Pearson-Korrelation	0,007	1	0,038	0,567	0,017	-0,150	-0,337
	p-Wert	0,983		0,908	0,055	0,958	0,641	0,285
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Pearson-Korrelation	0,099	0,038	1	0,452	,623*	0,220	-0,107
	p-Wert	0,760	0,908		0,140	0,030	0,492	0,742
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Methodik	Pearson-Korrelation	0,051	0,567	0,452	1	0,158	0,418	-0,338
	p-Wert	0,874	0,055	0,140		0,624	0,176	0,283
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Ergebnisdarstellung	Pearson-Korrelation	0,105	0,017	,623*	0,158	1	-0,203	-0,208
	p-Wert	0,745	0,958	0,030	0,624		0,527	0,517
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,241	-0,150	0,220	0,418	-0,203	1	0,242
	p-Wert	0,451	0,641	0,492	0,176	0,527		0,449
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Evaluationskosten	Pearson-Korrelation	0,086	-0,337	-0,107	-0,338	-0,208	0,242	1
	p-Wert	0,791	0,285	0,742	0,283	0,517	0,449	
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

*. Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

**. Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.

DEZA

		Leistungs- beschreibung	Executive Summary	Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Methodik	Ergebnis- darstellung	Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Evaluations- kosten
Leistungsbeschreibung	Pearson-Korrelation	1	-0,054	0,250	,598**	,490*	0,183	-0,015
	p-Wert		0,795	0,219	0,001	0,011	0,372	0,942
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Executive Summary	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,054	1	-0,025	0,162	0,099	0,060	0,207
	p-Wert	0,795		0,850	0,216	0,453	0,651	0,112
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
Einleitung & Kontextanalyse	Pearson-Korrelation	0,250	-0,025	1	0,243	0,168	0,022	-0,105
	p-Wert	0,219	0,850		0,061	0,198	0,868	0,426
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
Methodik	Pearson-Korrelation	,598**	0,162	0,243	1	,572**	,294*	-0,017
	p-Wert	0,001	0,216	0,061		0,000	0,023	0,899
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
Ergebnisdarstellung	Pearson-Korrelation	,490*	0,099	0,168	,572**	1	,331**	-0,137
	p-Wert	0,011	0,453	0,198	0,000		0,010	0,295
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
Schlussfolgerungen & Empfehlungen	Pearson-Korrelation	0,183	0,060	0,022	,294*	,331**	1	0,003
	p-Wert	0,372	0,651	0,868	0,023	0,010		0,981
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60
Evaluationskosten	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,015	0,207	-0,105	-0,017	-0,137	0,003	1
	p-Wert	0,942	0,112	0,426	0,899	0,295	0,981	
	N	26	60	60	60	60	60	60

** . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.

* . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

7.4.2 Qualitätsbewertung und DAC-Erfolgsbewertung

SECO (Spearman-Rho)

		Gesamt- bewertung	Relevanz- bewertung	Effektivitäts- bewertung	Effizienz- bewertung	Nachhaltigkeits- bewertung
Gesamt- qualität	Spearman-Rho	-,279*	-0,012	-0,063	-0,059	0,023
	p-Wert	0,028	0,928	0,610	0,641	0,851
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Leistungs- beschreibung	Spearman-Rho	-0,199	0,002	-0,111	-0,168	0,122
	p-Wert	0,119	0,990	0,374	0,189	0,328
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Executive Summary	Spearman-Rho	-0,177	-0,124	-0,132	-,271*	-0,034
	p-Wert	0,181	0,356	0,309	0,040	0,790
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Einleitung & Kontext- analyse	Spearman-Rho	-0,249	0,000	-0,041	0,162	0,025
	p-Wert	0,051	1,000	0,744	0,203	0,841
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Methodik	Spearman-Rho	-0,104	-0,083	0,020	0,069	-0,006
	p-Wert	0,420	0,527	0,875	0,591	0,960
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Ergebnisdar- stellung	Spearman-Rho	-0,146	0,088	0,065	-0,036	0,026
	p-Wert	0,252	0,494	0,601	0,777	0,831
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Schlussf. & Empfehlun- gen	Spearman-Rho	-0,166	0,139	-0,052	0,083	-0,144
	p-Wert	0,226	0,316	0,698	0,543	0,279
	N	42	41	42	40	40
Evaluations- kosten	Spearman-Rho	-0,008	0,243	-0,008	0,048	-0,314
	p-Wert	0,960	0,131	0,962	0,772	0,052
	N	41	40	41	39	39

** . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.

* . Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

DEZA (Pearson)

		Gesamt- bewertung	Relevanz- bewertung	Effektivitäts- bewertung	Effizienz- bewertung	Nachhaltigkeits- bewertung
Gesamt- qualität	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,248	-0,206	-0,091	-0,111	-0,228
	p-Wert	0,089	0,161	0,540	0,458	0,127
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Leistungs- beschreibung	Pearson-Korrelation	0,057	-0,189	0,104	0,128	0,048
	p-Wert	0,702	0,199	0,483	0,392	0,752
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Executive Summary	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,237	-0,202	-0,239	-0,158	-0,103
	p-Wert	0,104	0,169	0,101	0,288	0,496
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Einleitung & Kontext- analyse	Pearson-Korrelation	0,166	-0,197	0,257	,311*	0,093
	p-Wert	0,261	0,179	0,078	0,034	0,538
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Methodik	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,179	-0,043	-0,069	-0,150	-0,193
	p-Wert	0,225	0,774	0,639	0,313	0,198
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Ergebnisdar- stellung	Pearson-Korrelation	-,324*	-0,104	-0,168	-0,220	-,317*
	p-Wert	0,025	0,480	0,253	0,137	0,032
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Schlussf. & Empfehlun- gen	Pearson-Korrelation	-0,155	0,000	-0,067	-0,104	-0,161
	p-Wert	0,294	1,000	0,649	0,485	0,286
	N	48	48	48	47	46
Evaluations- kosten	Pearson-Korrelation	0,401**	0,075	0,079	0,262	0,342*
	p-Wert	0,005	0,610	0,593	0,075	0,020
	N	48	48	48	47	46

*. Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,05 (2-seitig) signifikant.

**.. Die Korrelation ist auf dem Niveau von 0,01 (2-seitig) signifikant.