

European Commission, DG INTPA Evaluation Support Service

Quality Assurance for Evaluation Terms of Reference

Evaluation Title	Type here
Review Date	Type here
Review Version of document (V1, V2,...)	Type here
Eval Module reference (if known)	Type here
Reviewed by (ESS staff/consultant name)	Type here

Legend: scores and their meaning	Scale	Explanation
	Fully compliant	The criterion was fully met (or exceeded)
	Minor shortcomings	The criterion was met with only minor shortcomings.
	Some shortcomings	The criterion was partially met with some shortcomings.
	Major shortcomings	There were major shortcomings
	Non-relevant	Criteria is ignored in scoring grid and related averages

0. CLARITY OF THE TOR		SCORE
0.1	ToR is easily readable, understandable and contains references/links to supporting documentation. It is free of jargon, acronyms are spelled out, and written in plain English or French.	Select from list
0.2	The ToR is free from bias and value judgements	Select from list
0.3	The ToR uses the right template	Select from list
		Section score

1. BACKGROUND		SCORE
1.1	The ToR defines relevant country [region/sector] background appropriately that reflects the situation at the time of the ToR development.	Select from list
1.2	The ToR provides required information in the table on the Intervention(s) to be evaluated.	Select from list
1.3	The ToR provides a good description of the intervention to be evaluated, including its target groups, timescale, geographical coverage and its evolution with time	Select from list
1.4	The ToR describes the logframe / intervention logic including its evolution since the design stage (if any)	Select from list
1.5	The ToR annex the present and past versions of the Logframe of the intervention(s).	Select from list
1.6	The ToR provides summarised results from previous evaluations or monitoring/ROM missions (even if financed by other agencies)	Select from list
1.7	The ToR includes at least a list of relevant stakeholders of intervention(s) including their relations with the Interventions itself	Select from list
		Section score

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT		SCORE
2.1	The Table for description of Evaluation is completed appropriately	Select from list
2.2	The ToR defines specific and realistic objectives of the evaluation and explains why the evaluation is needed and what purpose its results will be used for	Select from list
2.3	The ToR describes the main users of the evaluation (e.g., who will use the findings and how)	Select from list
2.4	The ToR considers the evaluation criteria in relation with the type of evaluation and its focus, e.g., by eliminating those that are not essential – and justifying this	Select from list
		Section score

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CONSISTENCY		SCORE
3.1	The ToR identifies a set of Evaluation Questions, organised in a meaningful way (by DAC+EU criteria or by transversal and/or thematic clusters)	Select from list
3.2	The total number of Evaluation Questions are equal to or less than 10	Select from list
3.3	Questions are detailed, open ended and focused on 'why' and 'how'	Select from list
3.4	Questions are sensitive to the context, including gender, age, and disabilities issues (as relevant)	Select from list
3.5	There is a clear coherence between objectives of evaluation (2.1), its scope (2.2.1) and the Evaluation Questions (2.2.2)	Select from list
		Section score

4. EVALUATION PHASES AND METHODOLOGY		SCORE
4.1	The ToR phases are appropriate and consistent to the scope of the eval (combining desk and field if needed, dissemination phase if needed)	<i>Select from list</i>
4.2	The TOR describes the specific methodological requirements that contractors are expected to develop in their proposal.	<i>Select from list</i>
4.3	The TOR states and reflect throughout the document the relevant cross-cutting issues as presented in the ToR Guidance document	<i>Select from list</i>
4.4	The ToR describes appropriate Reference Group Members and the size of the group is reasonable.	<i>Select from list</i>
		Section score

5. RESOURCING		SCORE
5.1	The ToR describes the expertise required, by category of experts (not per single expert), appropriate in terms of both evaluation and sectoral expertise.	<i>Select from list</i>
5.2	The ToR assigns team leadership to a professional evaluator of a consequent seniority and consistent management skills, with a proven track record of high quality evaluations.	<i>Select from list</i>
5.3	The ToR defines the minimum number of evaluators per category	<i>Select from list</i>
5.4	The ToR defines minimum number of working days per category	<i>Select from list</i>
5.5	The ToR provides appropriate allocation of the place of work	<i>Select from list</i>
		Section score

OVERALL SCORE		
	Category	Score
0	Clarity of the ToR	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
1	Background	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
2	Description of the Evaluation Assignment	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
3	Evaluation Questions & Consistency	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
4	Evaluation Phases and Methodology	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>
5	Resourcing	<i>will be calculated when filled</i>

Passing Criteria: for a document to pass the QA check, the average of the section scores must be either 'Fully compliant' or only 'Minor shortcomings' AND no section score should be scored 'Major shortcomings' or 'Some shortcomings'.