EVALUATION TOOLKIT

EVALUATION REPORT AND REVIEW TEMPLATE

The Evaluation Report Checklist and Review Template are tools to assist in developing and reviewing USAID Evaluation reports. The checklist provides a quick guide to understanding the minimal standards for an evaluation report, while the Review Template provides additional criteria for assessing the quality of the draft report during a peer review. For further guidance on developing an evaluation report, see the How-To Note: Preparing Evaluation Reports, Evaluation Report Template, ADS 201maa, Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report, and ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements.

	Evaluation Report Compliance Checklist	Evaluation Report Review Template
Correct Usage	Determine if required, essential, or highly recommended elements are present in an evaluation report and compliant with the USAID evaluation policies in the ADS.	Assess the quality of a draft evaluation report against evaluation standards
User	Mission or Operating Unit's Evaluation point of contact (or designee) in the Program Office.	Peer reviewer (individual who does not have a conflict of interest or who did not participate in the evaluation)

Evaluation Report Compliance Checklist

This Checklist is for determining if required, essential, or highly recommended elements are present in an evaluation report. It is not a means for assessing the quality of these elements. For assessing quality of a draft evaluation report as part of a peer review process, please see the Evaluation Report Review Template. For guidance on developing an evaluation report, see the How-To Note: Preparing Evaluation Reports, Evaluation Report Template, and ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements.

Evaluation Title:	
Evaluation Report Checked By:	Date:

EVALUATION REPORT COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

I. Structure and Content	✓	COMMENTS
1. Does the opening section of the report include:		
1.1. A title that identifies the evaluation as either an impact or performance evaluation, per the definitions in Automated Directives System (ADS) 201?		
1.2. Identification of the Operating Unit that commissioned the evaluation?		
1.3. An abstract of not more than 500 words briefly describing what was evaluated, evaluation questions, methods, and key findings or conclusions? (The abstract should appear on its own page immediately after the evaluation report cover).		
1.4. An executive summary 2–5 pages in length that summarizes key points (purpose and background, evaluation questions, intervention being evaluated, methods, findings, and conclusions)?		
1.5. Table of contents?		
1.6. List of acronyms?		
2. Does the main body of the report include:		
2.1. Description of evaluation purpose, including information on:		
2.1.1. Why the evaluation was conducted (purpose)?		
2.1.2. Who will use the results of the evaluation (audience)?		
2.1.3. How the results of the evaluation will be used (anticipated use(s))?		
2.2. Description of the strategy, intermediate result, project, activity, or intervention evaluated, including information on:		
2.2.1. Award number(s)?		
2.2.2. Award dates (start and end dates)?		
2.2.3. Funding level?		
2.2.4. Implementing partner(s)?		
2.2.5. Timeline showing dates of implementation?		
2.2.6. Major events impacting implementation?		
2.3. Background information on the strategy, intermediate result, project, activity or intervention evaluated, including information on:		
2.3.1. Country and/or sector context?		
2.3.2. The specific problem or opportunity the intervention addresses?		
2.3.3. The development hypothesis, theory of change, or simply how the intervention addresses the problem?		
2.4. List of the evaluation questions, including:		
2.4.1. Identification of all evaluation questions requiring sex-disaggregated data, the use of gender-sensitive data collection methods, and analysis of sex-specific differential impacts?		

2.4.2. If an impact evaluation, are the evaluation questions about measuring the change in specific outcome(s) attributable to a specific USAID intervention?		
2.5. Identification of existing and relevant strategy, project, or activity documents or performance information sources that were used, including monitoring data?		
2.6. Description of the evaluation method(s) for data collection and analysis, including:		
2.6.1. sampling strategy?		
2.6.2. number of days of fieldwork?		
2.6.3. evaluation team composition?		
2.7. Start and end dates of the evaluation (from award to final report)?		
2.8. Description of the strengths and limitations of the evaluation methodology and other factors which affected the evaluation quality?		
2.9. If an impact evaluation, does the evaluation include:		
2.9.1. A description of the extent to which the intervention followed the work plan?		
2.9.2. A detailed description of the method of deriving the comparison group?		
2.9.3. A statistical balance table showing how comparable the comparison group is to the treatment group?		
2.9.4. Statistical output tables showing the difference in the effect size between treatment and control groups with standard errors reported?		
2.9.5. Statistical table showing the minimum detectable effect size of each outcome variable analyzed?		
2.9.6. Cost analysis?		
2.10. Findings and conclusions?		
2.11. If recommendations are included, are they separated from findings and conclusions?		
2.12. Does the report address all evaluation questions in the Statement of Work (SOW) or document approval by USAID for not addressing an evaluation question?		
3. Do the annexes include:		
3.1. Timeline showing dates of data collection, baseline, and subsequent data collection, if applicable?		
3.2. The Evaluation Statement of Work, including any updates to the statement of work and descriptions of major changes to the Statement of Work and reasons for those changes?		
3.3. A description of evaluation methods and limitations (recommended to be included in an annex when methods are not described in full in the main body of the report)?		
3.4. All data collection and analysis tools used, such as questionnaires, checklists, survey instruments, and discussion guides?		
3.5. All sources of information properly identified and listed?		
3.6. Any “statements of difference” regarding significant unresolved differences of		

opinion by funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation team.		
3.7. Signed disclosures of conflict of interest forms from evaluation team members?		
3.8. Summary information about evaluation team members, including qualifications, experience, and role on the team?		
II. Format and Graphing Standards		COMMENTS
4. Does the cover include:		
4.1. USAID standard graphic identity/brand in the left area in a white field?		
4.2. The word "Evaluation" at the top of the title block with the report title underneath? (The report title should also include the word "evaluation").		
4.3. The following statement across the bottom of the cover page: "*This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by* [list authors and organizations involved in the preparation of the report]."? For an internal evaluation team, use the following statement: *"This publication was produced at the request of* [USAID/Mission or OU] *and prepared by an internal evaluation team comprised of* [list authors and affiliation]."		
4.4. One high-quality photograph representative of the strategy, project, activity, or intervention being evaluated?		
4.5. Month and year of the report publication (e.g. when final and approved by USAID Operating Unit)?		
4.6. The individual authors of the report, identifying the evaluation team leader?		
4.7. Does the title avoid acronyms that are not spelled out?		
4.8. Is the report font one of the approved USAID fonts?		
5. Does the inside front cover page include:		
5.1. A brief caption describing the image on the cover with photographer credit?		
6. Does the title page include:		
6.1. The report title repeated from the cover?		
6.2. The month and year of the report repeated from the cover?		
6.3. The standard disclaimer for publications by external authors: "The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development."?		

EVALUATION REPORT COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

Evaluation Report Review Template

This Review Template is for use during a peer review of a draft evaluation report for assessing the quality of the report. For each section of the evaluation report, the Template provides a series of questions to prompt considerations of quality during the review. A box is provided to check if the section under review should be revised, and a space is provided for comments. In providing comments during a peer review, reviewers should be familiar with what was asked of the evaluation team in the Evaluation SOW and provide actionable comments appropriate to the drafting stage of the evaluation report.

For checking if required elements of an evaluation report are simply present, please see the Evaluation Report Checklist.

Evaluation Title:	
Evaluation Report Reviewed By:	Date:

Executive Summary	**Check if revisions needed**
Does the executive summary provide an accurate reflection of the most critical elements of the report, including the evaluation purpose, questions, background information, methods, limitations, findings, and recommendations? The executive summary should not add new information or contradict the evaluation report.	
Comments:	
Introduction and Purpose	**Check if revisions needed**
Does the evaluation purpose represent the management intent (as described in the SOW)? Is it clear why the evaluation was conducted and who the primary and secondary audiences are?	
Comments:	
Information and Background	**Check if revisions needed**
Is the information provided about the country and/or sector context for the strategy/project/activity sufficient to provide a reader without prior knowledge a clear understanding of the subject of the evaluation? Are the basic characteristics of the strategy/project/activity being evaluated adequately described? Is the geographic scope clear (preferably with a map)? Are the interventions clearly described, and is the strategy/project/activity's theory of change sufficiently described (preferably with a graphic and narrative description)?	
Comments:	
Evaluation Questions	**Check if revisions needed**
Do the evaluation questions reflect the evaluation questions from the SOW? If they have been modified, does the report state that there was written approval for changes in the evaluation questions? If changed, are the new questions limited, clear, and researchable?	
Comments:	

EVALUATION REPORT COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

Methodology	Check if revisions needed
Does the methodology section (in report or annex) describe specific data collection and analysis methods in detail? Is it clear which methods are used to address each evaluation question (preferably through a design matrix)? Are the methods sound and appropriate for each of the evaluation questions (e.g., are the methods up to the task set forth by the evaluation questions)? Are the methods those that would generate the highest-quality and most credible evidence that corresponds to the questions being asked, taking into consideration time, budget, and other practical considerations? Are the methods based on social science methods and tools that reduce the need for evaluator-specific judgments? Does the documentation of the methods offer sufficient expectation that if another team applied the same methods, they would generate the same findings?	
Comments:	
Strengths and Limitations	**Check if revisions needed**
Are strengths and limitations of the methods used presented clearly and fully? Is it clear what has been done to mitigate limitations or to restrict findings to what is permissible given the limitations? Does attention to limitations flow through the entire document, including the executive summary? Are the conclusions and recommendations explicitly cognizant of the limitations? Does the report assume external validity?	
Comments:	
Findings and Conclusions	**Check if revisions needed**
Are all evaluation questions addressed in the main body of the report? Are findings credible—presented as analyzed facts logically linked to evidence, rather than anecdotes, hearsay, and unverified opinions or documentation (e.g., from strategy, project, or activity monitoring)? Are findings specific, concise, and supported by quantitative and qualitative information that is reliable and valid? Is it clear which quantitative and qualitative information supports which findings? Are the findings objective, such that if a different, well-qualified evaluator were to undertake the same evaluation, he or she would arrive at the same or similar findings and conclusions? If normative judgments are presented, is it clear what criteria were used to make those judgments? Are the findings clearly distinguished from conclusions and recommendations? Are the conclusions directly based on findings and evidence presented in the report?	
Comments:	
Recommendations (if included)	**Check if revisions needed**
Are recommendations specifically and clearly supported by findings and conclusions? Are they clearly separated from findings and conclusions? Are recommendations action-oriented, practical, and specific? Do the recommendations assign or designate the executor of each recommendation? Promising Practice: If there are recommendations included, did the evaluators develop or share the recommendations with key stakeholders in order to 'ground-truth' them? Is the process used to develop the recommendations clear? Is outside expert knowledge or evidence to support a recommendation properly cited?	
Comments:	
Annexes	**Check if revisions needed**
Sources of information: *Is the listing of sources of information in the annex clear and complete, including documents reviewed and individuals interviewed?* ***Data collection tools:*** *Are data collection tools included in the annex complete? Do they match what is described in the methods section?* ***Statements of Differences:*** *If any statements of differences are included, do the statements have merit? Did the evaluation*	

team respond appropriately? ***Evaluation team:*** *Is sufficient information provided about the evaluation team, including disclosure of conflict of interest statements? Are any potential conflicts of interest described, along with how they were mitigated?*	
Comments:	
Gender	**Check if revisions needed**
Do evaluation methods incorporate attention to gender relations in all relevant areas? Do findings and conclusions address gender where relevant and appropriate? If person-level outcome data are assessed, are they sex-disaggregated?	
Comments:	
Overall	**Check if revisions needed**
Is the report structured effectively and formatted appropriately? Is it well-written and clear? Overall, is the report a thoughtful, well-researched, and well-organized effort to objectively evaluate the strategy, project, or activity?	
Comments:	