Quality checklist for decentralized evaluation

Terms of reference

Version April 2024

[Title of the decentralized evaluation]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do not submit the TOR for DE Quality Support (DEQS) if it does not meet any of the quality criteria. REU Focal point (or CapQual incase of HQ-led DEs) as Quality Assurance Level 2 (QA2) should confirm that the TOR meet the criteria and are ready for submission to DEQS. If the TOR is submitted to DEQS without meeting the quality criteria it will be returned without review which could result in Delays. If in doubt whether a TOR is ready for submission OR you have reasons to want to submit incomplete IR, write to DE helpdesk:** [**wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org**](mailto:wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org) | | | | |
| **Overall** | | | | |
| **General** | | **Meets Criteria** | **Comments** | |
| **Title**   * Clear without being too long, reflecting the subject and type of the evaluation (i.e. mid-term/end-line)   **Length**   * Does not exceed 11,000 words, excluding annexes and table of contents. An additional 15 percent length [12,650 words in total] is allowed for deliverables written in French or Spanish   **Accessibility**   * The ToR is written in a clear and accessible manner * The ToR adequately emphasises the decentralized evaluation’s strategic and/or operational focus * The ToR provides a good substantive overview of the subject of the evaluation * The ToR provides sufficient information to stakeholders on how the evaluation will unfold, remaining focused and concise * The ToR provides sufficient information to the evaluation team on what is expected from them | |  |  | |
| **Editing** | | **Meets Criteria** |  | |
| * The ToR is written in line with the WFP editing style * The DEQAS template has been followed (not mandatory for joint evaluations) and all its elements, included standard text, are included in the ToR * Acronyms are spelled out the first time they are used * Paragraphs and pages are numbered * Cross-references are used * Table of contents is included and lists tables, graphs, figures and annexes * The report is free from grammar, spelling or punctuation errors * Maps, visuals, tables and diagrams are used as relevant and are numbered * Sources of data/quotes are provided (either directly below the table/graph or in footnotes) | |  |  | |
| 1. **Introduction** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Meets Criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| * Name of commissioning office * Purpose of ToR and evaluation * Type of evaluation (i.e. activity/thematic area/ transfer modality/pilot project/other) * Title of the evaluation * Brief description of the subject/scope (interventions/ activities, target group, geographical and temporal coverage) * Period covered by the evaluation | * Standard language is used and tailored where required * Expected content is provided in a clear and concise way | |  |  |
| 1. **Reasons for the evaluation** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Meets Criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| **2.1 Rationale** | | | | |
| * Specify why the evaluation is being commissioned * Specify why the evaluation is needed at this point in time * Specify how the evaluation will be used by WFP and other stakeholders, which decision-making process is this evaluation expected to inform | * Clear rationale * Clarity on how the timing of the evaluation meets the stated needs in decision-making processes * Intended use/utility is described | |  |  |
| **2.2 Objectives** | | | | |
| * Specify the objectives of the evaluation (e.g., accountability and learning), * Specify whether or not more weight is placed on accountability or learning. In either event, explain why * Specify whether human rights and gender equality considerations are reflected in a specific evaluation objective or mainstreamed in the evaluation's other objectives or in the evaluation | * Standard text used and objectives contextualized * Clear explanation of why the weight is more on accountability or learning (if applicable) | |  |  |
| **2.3 Key stakeholders** | | | | |
| * Identify main internal and external, primary and secondary stakeholders in the intervention; * Identify how different stakeholders are affected (in different ways) by the intervention being evaluated (women, men, boys and girls from different groups such as beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty bearers) * Specify expected interests and relative power of different stakeholders to influence the evaluation process and results of the intervention being evaluated and what use are they expected to make of the evaluation results * Indicate how beneficiaries’ perspectives (men, women, boys and girls) will be sought and considered in the evaluation process in line with WFP commitment to accountability to affected populations | * Standard text has been sufficiently contextualized * All relevant stakeholders (including internal and external) are identified, demonstrating impartiality * Demonstrates good understanding of stakeholder expected interests, roles and relative influencing power * Identification of users is closely linked to the objectives and rationale of the evaluation * Stakeholder analysis is gender-responsive and includes broader equity and inclusion considerations * Clear analysis of how WFP commitments to accountability to affected populations will be upheld; this implies that beneficiaries are identified as stakeholders and disaggregated in a way that reflects diversity | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Context and subject of the evaluation** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Meets Criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| **3.1. Context** | | | | |
| * Inclusion of information about the context within which the subject of the evaluation has been implemented, including: * Poverty, food and nutrition security in relation to evaluation subject * Key data and trends related to SDG 2/SDG 17 in the context (region, country subnational/local level) * Government policies, priorities and institutional capacity in relation to evaluation subject, including whether they are conducive to the advancement of human rights, gender equality and empowerment of women (GEWE) and wider equity considerations * Humanitarian issues, as they relate to food security and the subject of the evaluation, including social protection programme/s, migration patterns and host community/social tensions * GEWE, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the context and related to the programmatic area of the intervention * Features of international assistance from other actors in the area: long-standing donors/agencies in the country, level of resources, humanitarian and development assistance, etc. * Key external events that led to significant changes in WFP work * Other WFP work in the area | * Contextual information is focused and concise, up-to-date and relevant to understand the context for the subject of the evaluation * The section focuses on trend data, coherent with the scope of the evaluation * Data is commented on, not simply illustrated * The section assesses the context from the perspectives of GEWE, equity and inclusion |  | |  |
| **3.2. Subject of the evaluation** | | | | |
| * This section provides an overview of the evaluation subject and should include information such as: * Type of intervention/programme (Activity/ theme/transfer modality/pilot project/other subject of evaluation) * Geographic scope of the evaluation subject (including Map in Annex) * Relevant dates: approval date; start date; expected end date of the evaluation subject * Main partners (government; NGOs; bilateral; multilateral) * Planned outputs, including overview of planned and actual beneficiaries with breakdown by activity/component, disaggregated by sex and age, and amount of transfers (food, cash, vouchers) by activity * Planned outcomes in design * Key activities, including what is provided to whom and why * If existing or reconstructed theory of change, logic model or logical framework should be mentioned. If not available, this should also be mentioned * Resources (approved and funded, and percent of total funded requirements). Show resource allocated by each donor * Other (from WFP and/or other actors) relevant preceding/concurrent activities/interventions * Any changes in planned implementation in terms of coverage, budget, planned beneficiaries and explanations * Relevant conclusions/recommendations from past evaluations and reviews that are relevant to this evaluation * GEWE, equity and wider inclusion dimensions as relevant to food security and nutrition issues drawing from existing analysis. If there is no analysis to inform the programme, this fact should be explicitly noted. * Subject is described and located within a broader context, including its linkage with the Agenda 2030 * Maps/graphs for illustration | * All the expected content is included, and information is relevant and important to understand the subject of the evaluation: * What is the type of intervention/programme? * Where is it taking place? * When was it designed, when did it start, when will it end? * What are the key inputs (USD value, technical assistance/capacity strengthening activities)? * What is the strategic focus? * What are the key objectives outcomes and planned activities? * What are the planned outputs (beneficiaries, cash and voucher, USD)? * What is the total level of funding to the evaluation subject over the period under evaluation? * Are the modalities of the intervention presented and clearly explained (for example – capacity strengthening, technical assistance, or direct service delivery)? * Who is involved in the implementation? * Are relevant issues highlighted from past evaluations and reviews that are relevant to the evaluation? * Are GEWE, equity and wider inclusion dimensions explained and whether programme design was informed by a gender analysis? How has the subject of the evaluation addressed the conditions of different social groups? * Is the information presented in a way that allows capture of the key focus of the intervention and its evolution over time, if applicable, and are there any major shifts from the original to the current design? |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Evaluation scope, criteria and questions** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Meets Criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| * Overview of the scope/ parameters of the evaluation focusing on what the evaluation will and will not cover and should include information such as: * Time frame, start and cut off dates of the period under evaluation * Geographic areas * Components of interventions/activities to be evaluated, whether all or part of an activity, thematic area, pilot project or transfer modality * Specific target groups (including women and girls), that will be included / excluded in the evaluation scope. Exclusions should be justified * Integrate gender, equity and wider inclusion issues in the evaluation scope of analysis in a way that will ensure that related data will be collected. * Specify evaluation questions and main subquestions, balancing comprehensiveness and depth, and avoiding a very long list of subquestions * Mainstream gender, equity and wider inclusion issues throughout the evaluation questions * Link evaluation questions appropriately to selected evaluation criteria (not all of them necessarily) and ensure they are consistent with evaluation subject, purpose and objectives | * Clarity on duration/period that will be covered by the evaluation * Clear justification for the focus, including selection of activities and areas * Clear justification for the target groups covered and excluded by the evaluation * Clear integration of gender, equity and wider inclusion issues within the scope * Scope is realistic given time and resources available * Evaluation questions are clear and relevant to the subject, purpose and intended use of the evaluation. They have been tailored to the specific learning and accountability needs of the commissioning office * Evaluation questions are adequate and realistic in view of the time and resources available. They are not too many. * Evaluation questions are adequately linked to selected evaluation criteria and sufficiently address them. They cover unintended results * Gender, equity and wider inclusion issues are effectively mainstreamed throughout the questions and criteria |  | |  |
| **5. Methodological approach and ethical considerations** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Meets Criteria** | **Comments/status** | |
| **5.1. Evaluation approach** | | | | |
| * Standard text provided in the template * Presentation of the overall methodology for the evaluation outlining the criteria, impartiality requirement, and the methods that will be employed (quantitative, qualitative or mixed), including how triangulation will be addressed * Identify key risks and appropriate mitigation/ management measures for the methodology approach proposed for further refinement during inception as appropriate * Specify how gender issues will be addressed by gender-responsive evaluation methodology, tools, sampling frame and data analysis techniques. Similarly, specify how the diversity of stakeholders will be addressed * If relevant, specify how the analysis will be conducted against international humanitarian principles * If relevant, provide guidance for potential innovative approaches/ methods | * Standard text used and sufficiently contextualised * Clear delineation of the overall methodology for the evaluation outlining the data collection methods and overall approach to ensure impartiality * Clear line of sight among the methodology, approach, questions and data collection methods * Key risks and appropriate mitigation/management measures for proposed approach, satisfactorily identified * Sufficient detail to understand how gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be addressed by the methodology |  |  | |
| **5.2. Preliminary considerations on evaluability and methodological limitations** | | | | |
| * Identify the main sources of information/data available to the evaluation team * List limitations (e.g. clarity of frame of reference, data availability) and proposed ways for the evaluation team to deal with them * Describe data availability and quality of gender-disaggregated data, including existence of (or gaps in) data related to gender-specific outcomes. | * Clear indication of the data available and their sources * Limitations explained and implications for scope and methodology discussed, including reference to limitations for specific evaluation questions or subquestions * Suggested mitigation measures * Availability and quality of gender disaggregated data and existence/gaps of gender specific outcomes * Request for sampling and data collection tools and methods to be gender-sensitive |  |  | |
| **5.3. Ethical considerations** | | | | |
| * Use standard text provided in the template of ToR * List any potential ethical issues (including data protection risks) that have already been identified for the conduct of the evaluation and propose mitigation measures | * Standard text used and contextualized where required/possible * Consideration of ethical issues that may relate to the subject of the evaluation. If there are none, this fact should be indicated |  |  | |
| **5.4. Quality assurance** | | | | |
| * Use standard text provided in the template of ToR. * Identify additional measures to assure the quality of the process and product, and thus increase the credibility and impartiality of the evaluation. | * Standard text used * Quality assurance is built into the whole process by briefly showing how different products will be quality assured * Requirements are spelled out for the evaluation team to ensure validity and accuracy of data |  |  | |
| **6. Organization of the evaluation** | | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Meets Criteria** | Comments/status | |
| **6.1. Phases and deliverables** | | | | |
| * Include the summary timeline – key evaluation milestones table and detailed timeline in Annex 2 * Clarify the timing of the five evaluation phases, milestone/deadlines, specific tasks and deliverables and who is responsible * Ensure adequate time is budgeted for data analysis and for review, feedback and revision of draft evaluation report | * Summary timeline table is used in main section of TOR and detailed timeline in Annex 2 * Reasonable amount of time for each of the phases/steps is provided * Phases have clearly identified deliverables with responsible persons |  |  | |
| **6.2. Evaluation team composition** | | | | |
| * Describes: * The number of team members and whether a mix of national and international evaluator(s) will be required * The expertise/profiles and languages needed * The expected team composition, including areas of technical expertise and practical knowledge * Reporting lines and roles and responsibility of the team leader and team members | * Required expertise is relevant to the scope of the evaluation and proposed methodology, including in relation to GEWE * Explicit requirement for the evaluation team to be gender balanced and geographically and culturally diverse * The number of people to be included in the team is specified and is commensurate to the budget available, and the size and complexity of the intervention |  |  | |
| **6.3. Roles and responsibilities** | | | | |
| * Indicate how the evaluation will be conducted and led * Describe roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the evaluation process * TOR for EC annexed showing the members, roles and schedule of engagement * TOR for ERG annexed showing the members, roles and schedule of engagement | * All relevant stakeholders are identified, demonstrating impartiality * Clear understanding of stakeholder expected interests and concerns * Indirect stakeholders who may have a role are identified * Clarity on measures to ensure impartiality and credibility of the evaluation, as they relate to each stakeholder * Evaluation committee and the evaluation reference group have been established and their roles and responsibilities have been set out * There is a schedule of engagement of EC and ERG with estimated level of effort and tentative dates for each phase in the annexes |  |  | |
| **6.4. Security considerations** | | | | |
| * Use the standard text provided in the template of ToR * Specify any security considerations that may be relevant * Indicate any specific security considerations for women visiting the field sites and women respondents to the evaluation, and how measures will be put in place to mitigate them | * Standard text used and tailored (depending on contracting arrangements chosen by the commissioning office (recruitment of individual consultant or contracted services)) * Security considerations are relevant to the context for the evaluation * Security considerations take into account gender dimensions |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6.5. Communication** | | | |
| * Specify intentions in relation to the communication and knowledge management plan, and how this will be developed and include a GEEW-responsive dissemination strategy, indicating how findings will be disseminated * Determine communication-related roles and responsibilities * Specify the need for translation and the language of each report, if not English | * Communication-related roles and responsibilities have been set out * Communication and knowledge management plan is well explained and taken into account in timeline and budget, with clear indication of how the stakeholders will be involved throughout the process * Requirements for translation clearly set out * Findings’ dissemination strategy is well explained and considered in timeline and budget |  |  |
| **6.6. Proposal** | | | |
| * Use standard text provided in the template of the ToR | * Standard text used * Clarity on the cost elements that should be included in the evaluation budget such as for workshops or special communication efforts included, as appropriate. [Note: these will vary depending on the contracting option used] |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Annexes** | **Assessment criteria** | **Meets Criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| * Mandatory annexes include: * Map(s) * Evaluation timeline * Role and composition of the evaluation committee * Role and composition of the evaluation reference group * Communication, learning and knowledge management plan * Bibliography * Acronyms * Optional annexes include: * Any other technical annexes | * All mandatory annexes are included * Other technical annexes are necessary and relevant |  |  |