**Quality Checklist for Decentralized Evaluation Terms of reference**

**[title of the Decentralized evaluation]**

**Version April 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | | | |
| **General** | | **Comments/status** | |
| **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 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** | |  | |
| * + 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 spelt out the first time they are used   + Paragraphs and pages are numbered electronically   + 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. **Background** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| **1.1. Introduction** | | | |
| * 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, 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 | |  |
| **1.2. Context** | | | |
| Inclusion of information about the context within which the subject of the evaluation has been implemented, including:   * Poverty, food and nutrition security * Government policies, priorities and institutional capacity, including whether they are conducive to the advancement of GEWE and wider equity considerations * Humanitarian issues, including social protection programme/s, migration patterns and host community/social tensions * Key data and trends related to SDG 2/SDG 17 in the context (region, country subnational/local level) * Gender equality and empowerment of women (GEWE), equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the context * International assistance in the area * Work of other key actors * Key external events * Other WFP work in the area | * Contextual information is focused and concise * Information is up-to-date and relevant to understand the context for the subject of the evaluation * Data is commented on, not simply illustrated * The section focuses on trend data, coherent with the scope * The section assesses the context from the perspectives of gender equality and women’s empowerment, equity and inclusion | |  |
| 1. **Reasons for the evaluation** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| **2.1 Rationale** | | | |
| * Specify why the evaluation is being commissioned * Specify why it is needed at this point in time * Specify how the evaluation will be used by WFP and other stakeholders; which decision-making process is it expected to inform | * Clear rationale * Clarity on how the timing of the evaluation meets the stated needs in decision-making processes * Intended use is described | |  |
| **2.2 Objectives** | | | |
| * Specify the objectives of the evaluation (e.g. accountability and learning), specifying whether or not more weight is placed on accountability or learning. In either event, explain why | * Standard text used and objectives contextualized * Clear explanation of why the weight is more on accountability or learning (if applicable) | |  |
| **2.3 Stakeholder analysis** | | | |
| * Use the standard text provided in the template * Identify direct and indirect, internal and external stakeholders; analyse how they 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 their expected interests and relative power to influence the evaluation process and results of the intervention being evaluated and what use are they expected to make of the evaluation results * The stakeholder analysis should identify WHO the stakeholders are, WHY, HOW and WHEN they will be included in the evaluation process and WHAT their level of participation will be (distinguishing between intended primary and secondary users of the evaluation) * 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 equity and gender-responsive * 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. Subject of the evaluation** | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| **3.1 Subject of the evaluation** | | |
| This section provides an overview of the evaluation subject, including factual information such as:   * Activity/ theme/transfer modality/pilot project/other subject of evaluation * Geographic scope of the evaluation subject * Relevant dates: approval date; start date; expected end date of the evaluation subject * Main partners (government; NGOs; bilateral; multilateral) * Intended outcomes, outputs and key activities * Overview of planned and actual beneficiaries with breakdown by activity/component, disaggregated by sex and age * Amount of transfers (food, cash, vouchers), outputs of technical assistance/capacity strengthening activities * If existing or reconstructed, 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 * Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), equity and wider inclusion dimensions as relevant. If there is no analysis to inform the programme, this fact should be mentioned * 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 it is? * When it was designed? * 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 modes of engagement of WFP clearly explained (for example technical assistance, direct delivery or knowledge sharing)? * 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? * 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? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.2. Scope** | | |
| * Specify the focus of the evaluation including: time frame, interventions/activities, specific target groups (including women and girls), geographic areas * Specify what will be included and not included in the evaluation. 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 | * Clarity on what will be covered and what will not in relation to the subject /coverage * 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 by the evaluation * Clear integration of gender, equity and wider inclusion issues within the scope * Scope is realistic given time and resources available |  |
| 1. **Evaluation approach, methodology and ethics considerations** | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| **4.1. Evaluation questions and criteria** | | |
| * Use standard text provided in the template. * Specify evaluation questions and main subquestions * Mainstream gender, equity and wider inclusion issues throughout the evaluation questions * Link evaluation questions appropriately to selected evaluation criteria and ensure they are consistent with evaluation subject, purpose and objectives | * Standard text used and sufficiently contextualized * Evaluation questions are clear and relevant to the subject, purpose and intended use of the evaluation. They have been tailored to the specific leaning and accountability needs of the commissioning office * Evaluation questions are adequate and realistic in view of the time and resources available * Evaluation questions are adequately linked to selected evaluation criteria and sufficiently address them * Gender, equity and wider inclusion issues are effectively mainstreamed throughout the questions and criteria |  |
| **4.2. Evaluation approach and methodology** | | |
| * Use standard text provided in the template * Present 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 | * 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 |  |
| **4.3. Evaluability assessment** | | |
| * 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 |  |
| **4.4. 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 |  |
| **4.5. 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 |  |
| **5. Organization of the evaluation** | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | **Comments/status** |
| **5.1. Phases and deliverables** | | |
| * Include the evaluation schedule * Clarify the timing of the five evaluation phases, specific tasks and the key outputs and milestones * Ensure adequate time is budgeted for data analysis and for review, feedback and revision of draft evaluation report | * Summary timeline table is used * Reasonable amount of time for each of the phases/steps is provided * Phases have clearly identified deliverables with responsible persons |  |
| **5.2. Evaluation team composition** | | |
| Describes:   * The expertise/profiles and languages needed * The expected team composition * Reporting lines and roles and responsibility of the team leader and team members | * Required expertise is relevant to the scope of the evaluation, 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 |  |
| **5.3. Roles and responsibilities** | | |
| * Indicate how the evaluation will be conducted and led * Describe roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the evaluation process | * 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 |  |
| **5.4. 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 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. **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 |  |
| * 1. **Budget** | | |
| * 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** | **Comments/status** |
| Mandatory annexes include:   * Map(s) * Evaluation timeline * Role and composition of the evaluation committee * Role and composition of the evaluation reference group * Any other technical annexes * Communication and knowledge management plan * Bibliography * Acronyms | * Complete and necessary |  |