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*This template outlines one of the most common ways to structure an evaluation which includes qualitative analysis. This example assumes you are using thematic analysis, but the overall structure can be adapted for any form of qualitative analysis. Using this format will help you to achieve Standard 2 on the Project Oracle Standards of Evidence. Other reporting styles are acceptable.*

# 1. Executive Summary

This section is optional, and is useful for summarising longer reports. It should cover a brief summary of the report (normally no more than 2 pages). This normally includes:

* 1. Background, including the aim of the project.
	2. Methodology, including the aim of the evaluation.
	3. Findings.
	4. Conclusions (key findings and recommendations.

# 2. Background

This section should cover background information on the programme or the organisation and an overview of the project. This could include:

* 1. The need for the project (e.g. the project works in an area of high deprivation) and/or the history of the project.
	2. Intended outcomes.
	3. An outline of what the project activities and outputs are, how it is delivered, who takes part and for how long.
	4. Timeline for development of the project. This could include information on timelines for future evaluations.
	5. Theory of Change diagram and/or description.

# 3. Methodology

This section should provide a detailed description of the method that was used to conduct the evaluation. It should give enough information that someone who was not involved in evaluating it, can clearly follow the steps and rationale behind it. This could include:

* 1. An outline of the research questions i.e. what was the aim(s) of this evaluation? This might be to reach a higher Standard of Evidence, for example.
	2. An outline of your evaluation design e.g. did you conduct case studies, experimental design, longitudinal and pre-post testing.
	3. An outline of your sample, to include how the participants were selected, why they were selected in this way, how many were selected, demographic characteristics (e.g. age, gender…).
	4. An outline of the steps taken to ensure that ethics were maintained, such as a description of how the consent of participants was obtained, and confidentiality maintained.
	5. An outline of the evaluation tools you used e.g. details of questionnaires/interview guides used and details of the process by which measurement tools were used. For example if a survey was used, a description of how and when the survey was distributed and the conditions under which they were filled out. This is important as it allows you to highlight the suitability of the tool for the assessment.
	6. An outline of methodological limitations e.g. review / critique of the limits of the methods and the effects that this might have on the data.

# 4. Results

* 1. Start by summarising the categories and themes you have identified. For instance, you might state that ‘we found 4 themes, namely A, B, C and D. These can be grouped into 2 categories, X and Y.
	2. Include a table or diagram summarising the categories and themes, and how they link together.

Example Diagram:

Theme 1

**Category 1**

Theme 2

Theme 3

**Category 2**

Theme 4

Theme 5

Then move onto exploring each of the themes in detail. For example:

***Theme 1:***

* 1. Outline the key findings in relation to the theme. Findings should be clearly related to the research questions identified.
	2. Add 1 – 3 direct quotations from participants. Quotations should be explained in the text which follows them. Make it obvious to the reader how the quotation relates to the theme in question, and what the quotation adds to your understanding. Avoid leaving quotations ‘floating’ without any further explanation, as it may not be clear to the reader what point you are trying to make
	3. Indicate how many participants mentioned, agreed or disagreed with a viewpoint. For instance, ‘7/10 respondents made similar comments’, or ‘the majority made similar comments’.
	4. Include the results of any quantitative data you have collected, such as using surveys. Consider whether the numerical data supports or contradicts the qualitative data, and explore what this might mean. If the two types of data contradict each other, this may lead you to more complex conclusions than originally expected. You may want to do more research to follow this up.
	5. Compare your findings with any existing research literature, to see whether your work supports or contradicts existing work.

***Theme 2….(as theme 1)***

***Theme 3…(as theme 1)***

# 5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Outline the original problem/research questions.

Briefly summarise how the data you have collected relates to your research questions. State clearly and briefly what the answers were to these questions.

Consider whether your findings confirmed your expectations and align with existing literature, or whether you have been surprised by some of the material.

Highlight the major ideas which link your categories or themes together

Consider what impact your findings might have on your future work, including whether it might stimulate you to conduct more research. Make recommendations as appropriate

# 6. References

E.g. Smith, A. (XXX). Evaluation Research.

# 7. Appendices

In this section, you may include:

* 1. The theory of change diagram.
	2. Raw data.
	3. Example surveys, questionnaires, interview guides etc.
	4. You may want to include copies of any interview transcripts you have made. This is advisable for student dissertations or university-related projects. It may also be required for reports submitted to national government bodies. For reports given to charitable foundations, local government bodies, staff or the general public, you usually do not need to include copies of transcripts.

If you are including copies of transcripts, ensure that you have edited out personal details to ensure that no-one can guess the identity of participants. If you are working with a small group where it is impossible to hide the identities of participants, it may be best *not* to include transcripts.