**M&E: Framework** – Project Rubric

*This tool is included in the Participant Guide.*

**Criteria/Grade: Correctness & Clarity (15%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0-2.9**Non-existent / Very Poor | The text is full of grammar and spelling mistakes. It is misleading, inconsistent and / or unintelligible.  |
| **3-4.9**Unsatisfactory / Poor | The text is not fully clear. Grammar and spelling mistakes make it difficult to read interpret.  |
| **5-6.9**Good | The text is correct with only a few minor grammar or spelling mistakes. The descriptions are clear and reading smooth. |
| **7-8.9**Very Good | The text is correct with no grammar or spelling mistakes. Sentences are well constructed, arguments clear, and reading is fluid. |
| **9-10**Excellent | Grammar is impeccable. The text uses a rich and appropriate vocabulary, describing the elements in an appropriate way. Reading is both pleasant and informative.  |

**Criteria/Grade: Completeness (15%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0-2.9**Non-existent / Very Poor | Very few or even none of the results chain components are described. There is no data quality assessment of the indicators.  |
| **3-4.9**Unsatisfactory / Poor | Only some elements of the results chain are described. There is no data quality assessment of the indicators. |
| **5-6.9**Good | All but a few minor elements of the results chain are described. Data quality is assessed for at least one outcome indicator, or for two non-outcome indicators.  |
| **7-8.9**Very Good | All the elements of the results chain are described. Data quality is assessed for one outcome indicator, or for two non-outcome indicators.  |
| **9-10**Excellent | All the elements of the results chain are fully described. Data quality is assessed for at least two indicators, one of which is an outcome indicator.  |

**Criteria/Grade: Structure and Consistency (35%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0-2.9**Non-existent / Very Poor | The M&E Framework has fewer than 40% of it's elements in their logical order. The descriptions of the components are not aligned with each other at all.  |
| **3-4.9**Unsatisfactory / Poor | The M&E Framework has fewer than 60% of its elements in their logical order. The descriptions of the components are poorly aligned with each other.  |
| **5-6.9**Good | The M&E Framework includes at least 60% of its elements in their logical order. The descriptions of the components are generally aligned with each other, with only some minor inconsistencies.  |
| **7-8.9**Very Good | The M&E Framework includes at least 80% of its elements in their logical order. The descriptions of the components are mostly aligned with each other.  |
| **9-10**Excellent | The M&E Framework includes all elements in their logical order. The descriptions of the components are perfectly aligned with each other.  |

**Criteria/Grade: Accuracy (35%)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **0-2.9**Non-existent / Very Poor | Very few or none of the components of the M&E Framework are formulated according to the definition of each element of the results chain and the data quality assessment items.  |
| **3-4.9**Unsatisfactory / Poor | Less than a half of the components of the M&E Framework are formulated according to the definition of each element of the results chain and the data quality assessment items.  |
| **5-6.9**Good | Only between one-half and two-thirds of the components of the M&E Framework are formulated according to the definition of each element of the results chain and the data quality assessment items.  |
| **7-8.9**Very Good | All but few components of the M&E Framework are formulated in close accordance with the definition of each element of the results chain and the data quality assessment items.  |
| **9-10**Excellent | All components of the M&E Framework are formulated in close accordance with the definition of each element of the results chain and the data quality assessment items.  |