



EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK CHECKLIST AND REVIEW TEMPLATE

The Evaluation Statement of Work (SOW) Compliance Checklist and Review Template are tools to assist in developing and reviewing USAID Evaluation SOWs.

The checklist provides a quick guide to understanding the minimal standards for an Evaluation SOW, while the Review Template provides additional criteria for assessing the quality of the SOW during a peer review. For further guidance on developing an Evaluation SOW, see the [Evaluation Statement of Work How-to Note and Template](#).

	Evaluation SOW Compliance Checklist	Evaluation SOW Review Template
Correct Usage	Determine if required, essential, or highly recommended elements are present in an Evaluation SOW and compliant with USAID evaluation policies in ADS 201	Assess the quality of an Evaluation SOW against Evaluation SOW standards
User	Mission or Operating Unit's Evaluation point of contact (or designee) in the Program Office	Peer reviewer

Evaluation Statement of Work Compliance Checklist

This checklist is for determining if required, essential, or highly recommended elements are present in an Evaluation SOW. It is not a means for assessing quality of these elements. For assessing quality of the Evaluation SOW as part of a peer review process, please see the Evaluation Statement of Work Review Template. For guidance on developing an Evaluation SOW, see the [Evaluation Statement of Work How-to Note and Template](#).

Evaluation Title:		
Evaluation SOW Review By:	Date:	
1. Information about the Strategy, Project, or Activity Evaluated	✓	Comments
1.1. Does the SOW identify the evaluation as either an impact or performance evaluation, per the definitions in Automated Directives System (ADS) 201?		
1.2. Does the SOW identify the specific strategy, project, activity, or intervention to be evaluated?		
1.2.1. Award number(s) listed?		
1.2.2. Award dates listed (start and end dates)?		
1.2.3. Funding level listed?		
1.2.4. Implementing partner(s) listed?		
2. Background Information		
2.1. Does the SOW provide country and/or sector context?		
2.2. Does the SOW describe the specific problem or opportunity the intervention was designed to address?		
2.3. Does the SOW describe how the intervention addresses the problem?		
2.4. Does the SOW specify what existing and relevant strategy, project, or activity documents or performance information sources will be available to the evaluation team?		
3. Purpose		
3.1. Does the SOW state why the evaluation is being conducted (purpose)?		
3.2. Does the SOW state who will use the results of the evaluation (audience)?		
3.3. Does the SOW state the anticipated use(s) of the evaluation?		
4. Evaluation Questions		
4.1 Does the SOW include a list of 1-5 questions that are answerable with empirical evidence and relevant to future programmatic decisions or learning?		
4.1.1 Per ADS 201 mab, do evaluation questions avoid ambiguous terms, such as “effective,” “sustainable,” “efficient,” “relevant,” “objectives,” “results,” and “success” unless these are well-defined?		
4.2. Does the SOW identify all questions requiring sex-disaggregated data, the use of gender-sensitive data collection methods, and analysis of differential impacts on males and females?		

Evaluation Statement of Work Compliance Checklist

Evaluation Title:		
Evaluation SOW Review By:	Date:	
If Impact Evaluation:		
4.3. Are the questions about measuring the change in specific outcome(s) attributable to a specific USAID intervention?		
4.4. Is there a question describing the extent to which implementation of the intervention evaluated followed the work plan?		
5. Purpose Data Collection and Analysis Methods		
5.1. Does the SOW specify data collection methods or request that prospective evaluators propose qualitative and/or quantitative methods?		
5.2. Does the SOW specify data analysis methods or request that prospective evaluators propose qualitative and/or quantitative plans?		
5.3. Does the SOW communicate methodological strengths and limitations or request that the prospective evaluators do so?		
If Impact Evaluation:		
5.4. Does the SOW require specific experimental or quasi-experimental methods or request that prospective evaluators propose experimental or quasi-experimental methods?		
5.5 Does the SOW state the unit (e.g., individual, household, village) to be randomized for experiment designs or matched for quasi-experimental designs?		
5.6 Does the SOW state or ask the prospective evaluators to propose how many units there are in the country or context to be randomized or matched?		
5.7 <u>If quasi-experimental design</u> , does the SOW identify baseline data sources or ask the evaluator to propose baseline data sources?		
6. Methods Evaluation Deliverables		
6.1. Does the SOW request a written design that includes key questions, methods, main features of data collection instruments, and a data analysis plan?		
6.2. Does the SOW require a draft report?		
6.3. Does the SOW require a final report with (at minimum) the following?		
6.3.1. An executive summary 2-5 pages in length that summarizes key points (purpose and background, evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions)		
6.3.2. The Evaluation SOW in an annex		
6.3.3. Any “statements of differences” regarding significant unresolved differences of opinion by funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation team in an annex		
6.3.4. All data collection and analysis tools used—such as questionnaires, checklists, survey instruments, and discussion guides—in an annex		
6.3.5. All sources of information properly identified and listed in an annex		
6.4. Are dates or timeframes specified for deliverables?		
6.5. Are quantitative data collected by the evaluation requested to be provided		

Evaluation Statement of Work Compliance Checklist

Evaluation Title:		
Evaluation SOW Review By:	Date:	
in an electronic file, in an easily readable format, and organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation?		
6.6. Does the SOW include criteria for evaluation reports from the ADS 201maa Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report?		
If Impact Evaluation:		
6.7 Does the SOW list required elements outlined in ADS 201mah ?		
6.7.1 Does the SOW ask for mandatory cost analysis, per ADS 201.3.6.4?		
6.7.2 Does the SOW ask for a statistical balance table and statistical output tables to demonstrate treatment and control groups are comparable?		
6.7.3 Does the SOW include a detailed explanation of the method of deriving the comparison (i.e., control) group? If a quasi-experimental method, the SOW is required to provide an explanation of how the comparison group was formed and the source of the comparison group respondents (e.g., government administrative data list or census or evaluator conducted household survey)?		
7. Evaluation Team Independence and Qualifications		
7.1. Does the SOW identify expectations about the methodological and subject matter expertise and composition of the evaluation team, including expectations concerning the involvement of local evaluation team members and evaluation specialists?		
7.2. Does the SOW require team members provide a written disclosure of conflicts of interest (COI) and require key personnel to submit their COI disclosure with the proposal?		
7.3. Does the SOW describe intended participation of USAID staff, implementing partners, national counterparts, or beneficiaries in the design or conduct of the evaluation?		
8. Methods Schedule and Logistics		
8.1. Does the SOW state the expected period of performance?		
8.2. Does the SOW specify any scheduling, logistics, security requirements, or other support that USAID will provide?		
9. Methods Level of Effort (LOE) and Budget		
9.1. Does the SOW include illustrative information about the LOE expected?		
9.2. Is the SOW accompanied by an independent government cost estimate (if applicable)?		

Evaluation Statement of Work Review Template

This review template is for use during a peer review of an Evaluation Statement of Work (SOW) for assessing the quality of an Evaluation SOW. For each section of the Evaluation SOW, 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. For checking if required elements of an Evaluation SOW are simply present, please see the [Evaluation Statement of Work Compliance Checklist](#).

Evaluation Title:	
Evaluation SOW Review By:	Date:
Strategy, project, activity, or intervention information and background	Check if revisions needed
<i>Is sufficient information provided about the country and/or sector context for the strategy/project/activity? Are the basic characteristics of the strategy/project/activity adequately described? Is the geographic scope of the program clear (preferably with a map)? Are the interventions clearly described, and is the strategy/project/activity's theory of change understandable (preferably with a graphic and narrative description)? Are sufficient background documents and data provided to assist the evaluators in proposing an evaluation methodology?</i>	
Comments:	
Purpose	Check if revisions needed
<i>Does the evaluation clearly and sufficiently describe the purpose of the evaluation? Is it clear what management decisions the evaluation will inform? Is it clear who the primary and secondary audiences are (such as USAID managers, implementing partners, government agencies, other donors, etc.)? Does the purpose avoid repeating the evaluating questions?</i>	
Comments:	
Evaluation questions	Check if revisions needed
<i>Do the evaluation questions concern the USAID strategy/project/activity being evaluated? Are they relevant to the evaluation purpose and tied to the decisions they are intended to inform? Are they limited in number (five or fewer) and limited in scope? Are the questions clear, with narrative text or other explanatory information provided to aid understanding? Are the questions researchable with social science methods? Are the questions useful for decision-making? Are all sub-questions relevant to their parent question? Is gender integrated into the questions where appropriate? Does the SOW identify all questions for which gender-disaggregated data are expected? Is the priority of the evaluation questions clear? Are requests for recommendations clear and separated from the main evaluation questions?</i>	
Comments:	
Methodology	Check if revisions needed
<i>Does the methodology section provide illustrative methods linked to each evaluation question (e.g., is a design matrix included)? Are suggested qualitative and quantitative methods specific? Is guidance on likely methods (and sampling or case selection) sufficient to enable the evaluator to effectively budget for the evaluation? Is sufficient information included about the level of precision or rigor needed? Does the methodology define criteria to be used in making evaluative judgments (for normative questions) or request that the evaluators propose specific criteria for evaluative judgments? Is the methodology clear if specific sites are to be visited as part of data collection? Are required or requested data disaggregations clearly described? Does the methodology section provide an opportunity for the evaluators to propose more innovative or more appropriate methods?</i>	

Evaluation Statement of Work Review Template

Evaluation Title:		
Comments:		
Deliverables	Check if revisions needed	
<i>Is the SOW clear and specific about the deliverables being requested? Are dissemination requirements clear (e.g., numbers of hard copies of final report needed, PowerPoint/handouts for oral briefings, etc.)? Are dates or timeframes for the deliverables clear? Are the deliverables appropriate? Are there additional deliverables that would benefit the conduct or utility of the evaluation?</i>		
Comments:		
Evaluation team	Check if revisions needed	
<i>Are the specific skills (e.g., language, evaluation skills, technical skills) and experience (e.g., country/sector experience) needed for the evaluation team clearly defined and appropriate? Is at least one team member requested to be an evaluation specialist? Are the evaluation team requirements consistent with the methodology and budget of the evaluation? Are the evaluation team requirements obtainable (e.g., does the SOW refrain from over-specifying and/or demanding excess evaluation skills and experience)? Is the SOW clear if the evaluation team is expected to include a local evaluation specialist? Is the SOW clear if a USAID staff member (or other designated individual) will participate in the evaluation team and what the roles and responsibilities will be? Are requirements to include particular personnel reasonable?</i>		
Comments:		
Schedule and logistics	Check if revisions needed	
<i>Is the SOW clear about dates that need to be reflected in the evaluation team plan? Is the SOW clear about any logistical support that will be provided by USAID (e.g., space, cars, or other equipment) or if the team is expected to make its own arrangements? Is the logistical support reasonable? Is sufficient detail provided regarding the evaluation timeframe?</i>		
Comments:		
Budget and Level of Effort (LOE)	Check if revisions needed	
<i>Is expected LOE clear (preferably in the form of a matrix of team members by days allocated by task)? Is the proposed LOE and IGCE consistent with the proposed evaluation questions, methods, and evaluation team? Is the proposed LOE and IGCE sufficient for developing and testing the design and data collection instruments prior to fieldwork and for analyzing data to prepare the evaluation report after fieldwork?</i>		
Comments:		
Overall	Check if revisions needed	
<i>Is the relationship between the evaluation questions, methods, evaluation team, and budget clear and reasonable? Will the SOW likely lead to a high-quality and useful evaluation?</i>		
Comments:		