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Evaluation Design Report

[name(s) of evaluation]

**\*Name of Evaluation\* Design**

The design proposal is similar to an inception report. It should be clearly written in narrative format. It needs to build on what is presented in the SOW, what has been gleaned from the initial desk review, and any clarifications provided during initial meetings with USAID and the partner. The main content of the inception report should be between 8-12 pages. There is no page limit on the annexes.

**A. INTRODUCTION**

* Brief summary of the program and evaluation
* List of Evaluation Questions
* The evaluation team’s understand and interpretation of the Evaluation Questions, with an emphasis on how each question will be answered

**B. EVALUATION DESIGN**

* Framework for analysis (i.e. before and after, planned and actual, etc.)
* Lines of inquiry for analysis (i.e. policy, organizational, beneficiary, etc.)
* Any other key considerations

**C. DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

* Introduction
* Table of Methods per Question, to be extracted from G2A (sample below)

Table 1: Sample data collection methods for the five evaluation questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Collection Methods** | **Evaluation Questions** |
| Desk Review | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Group Discussions | 1, 3, 4, 5 |
| Key Informant Interviews | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Field Observation and Site Visits | 1, 3, 4, 5 |
| Survey | 1, 2, 3 |

* Listing of each Method: details on the method and how it will be applied to the evaluation
  + Include table of illustrative list of documents reviews; illustrative list of Key Informants to be interviewed, etc.
  + Include sampling criteria relevant for different data collection methods, i.e. purposive or random; criteria for selection; method of selection.
  + Add paragraph describing each method, contextualized for the specific evaluation (see list of method descriptions from MSI)
  + Check for consistency with the G2A

**D. DATA ANALYSIS METHODS**

* Introduction
* Table of Methods per Question, to be extracted from G2A (sample below)

Table 3: Sample data analysis methods for the five evaluation questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Analysis Methods** | **Evaluation Questions** |
| Comparison Analysis | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Trend/Pattern analysis | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Capacity Self-Assessment Quantification and Analysis | 1 |
| Information flow and validation analysis | 2, 3 |
| Validation Meeting | 1, 3, 4, 5 |

* List each Method: details on the method and how it will be applied to the evaluation, with a paragraph describing each method, contextualized for the specific evaluation (see list of method descriptions from MSI)
* Check for consistency with G2A

**ANNEXES**

1. *Getting to Answers* (G2A)
2. Workplan
3. Tools
4. References
5. Roles & Responsibilities

**ANNEX I: Getting to Answers**

**Program or Project:**

**Team Members:**

| EvaluationQuestions | **Type of Answer/**  **Evidence Needed**  **(Check one or more, as appropriate)** | | **Methods for Data Collection,**  e.g., Records, Structured Observation, Key Informant Interviews, Mini-Survey[[1]](#footnote-1) | | Sampling or Selection Approach,  **(if one is needed)** | Data Analysis  Methods, e.g.,  Frequency Distributions, Trend Analysis, Cross-Tabulations, Content Analysis |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Data Source(s) | Method |  |  |
|  |  | Yes/No |  |  |  |  |
|  | Description |
|  | Comparison[[2]](#footnote-2) |
|  | Explanation[[3]](#footnote-3) |
|  |  | Yes/No |  |  |  |  |
|  | Description |
|  | Comparison |
|  | Explanation |
|  |  | Yes/No |  |  |  |  |
|  | Description |
|  | Comparison |
|  | Explanation |
|  |  | Yes/No |  |  |  |  |
|  | Description |
|  | Comparison |
|  | Explanation |
|  |  | Yes/No |  |  |  |  |
|  | Description |
|  | Comparison |
|  | Explanation |

**ANNEX II: Workplan (Sample)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MISSION:** Final Evaluation of USAID's contribution to LWF | | | |
| **DATES:** April 23 - July 1 | |  |  |
| **CONSULTANTS:** Theo Hendriksen (TL) & Fabian Musila (Technical Advisor) | | | |
| **COR: Beatrice Wamalwa; alternative: Ben Wandango** | | | |
| **Day** | **Date** | **City** | **Activity** |
| Tues-Fri (4) | April 23-26 | Home base | Desk Review |
| Mon-Fri (5) | April 29-May 3 | Nairobi | Team Planning Meeting |
| Sun | 5-May | In transit to Nanyuki | TRAVEL |
| Mon (6) | 6-May | Nanyuki | 8:30 Meeting with LWF; partner KIIs |
| Tues (7) | 7-May | Nanyuki | Partner KIIs |
| Wed (8) | 8-May | Nanyuki | Partner KIIs |
| Thur (9) | 9-May | Nanyuki | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Fri (10) | 10-May | Nanyuki | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Sat (11) | 11-May | Nanyuki | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Sun | 12-May | Rumurti | N/A |
| Mon (12) | 13-May | Rumurti | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Tues (13) | 14-May | Rumurti | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Wed (14) | 15-May | Nanyuki | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Thur (15) | 16-May | Nanyuki | Discussion Groups, KIIs |
| Fri (16) | 17-May | Nanyuki | Stakeholder Meeting |
| Sat (17) | 18-May | In transit to Nairobi | TRAVEL |
| Sun | 19-May | Nairobi | N/A |
| Mon (18) | 20-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis |
| Tues (19) | 21-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis |
| Wed (20) | 22-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis |
| Thur (21) | 23-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis |
| Fri (22) | 24-May | Nairobi | F/C/R Workshop |
| Sat (23) | 25-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis & preparation of ppt |
| Sun | 26-May | Nairobi | N/A |
| Mon (24) | 27-May | Nairobi | Data Analysis & preparation of ppt |
| Tues (25) | 28-May | Nairobi | Debriefing to USAID, partner |
| Wed (26) | 29-May | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Thurs (27) | 30-May | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Fri (28) | 31-May | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Sat (29) | 1-Jun | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Sun | 2-Jun | Nairobi | N/A |
| Mon (30) | 3-Jun | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Tue (31) | 4-Jun | Nairobi | Report Writing |
| Wed (32) | 5-Jun | Nairobi | Submit Draft to USAID |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wed | 19-Jun |  | Comments Received by USAID |
| Mon | 1-Jul |  | Final Report submitted to USAID |

**ANNEX V: Roles and Responsibilities (Sample)**

**Evaluation Team Members and Designated Tasks**

**Tom Easterling**, Team Leader, will be responsible for team organization, scheduling, and primary liaison with the USAID Mission staff regarding technical aspects of the evaluation. He will have overall responsibility for the preparation and submission of the final report with substantial input from the other team members. The other team members will report to him on evaluation issues.

The team leader will take the lead in preparing the project schedule and work plan, and will work closely with the other team members to determine information requirements, develop key questions, conduct interviews, and gather other relevant information. He will also lead the team’s effort to prepare and deliver a presentation on the team’s response to the evaluation questions, as well as the findings, conclusions and recommendations for future action at the team’s final meeting with USAID/Kenya.

Mr. Easterling will also supervise the preparation of the final report, and will ensure the quality of its contents. Upon receiving USAID’s comments on the final draft report, he will be responsible for making any final corrections and improvements, and the submission of the final version to USAID.

**Felix M’mboyi, Ph.D**, Agricultural Economist, a Kenyan citizen with a PhD in Sustainable Development from Atlantic International University in the United States, has qualifications in Management Focused Monitoring and Evaluation from the World Bank Institute in Washington DC, and also data processing qualifications using SPSS from Michigan States University in the USA. Dr. M’mboyi has over 14 years’ experience in research, agriculture & development policy analysis and development management.

Mr. M’mboyi and the team leader will work closely to organize, schedule, and conduct the open-ended interviews; he will lead the focus group discussions, and he will have shared responsibility for drafting the field notes after each interview. He will also be responsible for drafting specific sections of the final report.

**TNS RMS:** MSI has contracted with the Kenyan firm, TNS RMS to design and conduct the farmer survey, and process the data. This firm will also provide administrative support to the evaluation team to help organize the FGDs and to record the meeting notes from these discussions.

TNS RMS is the longest standing and largest research agency in Africa.  Its main areas of social research focus is needs understanding, benchmark and baseline studies, impact assessment and M&E and innovation applied to social or public aims, combining both qualitative and quantitative methods. The day-to-day project management is handled by Purity Mwaura, who has over 4 years of research experience managed over 10 projects in various African markets.

The project is guided by Nkatha Mutiga, Research manager, who has 7 years of experience in project management and community development, and Geoffrey Kimani, Director – Research and Insights, supported the team with technical guidance. Geoffrey has over 15 years of experience in managing research projects in Africa covering diverse topics such as behavior change research, program monitoring and evaluation, impact assessment, communication development, innovation and product development.

1. Data from evaluations are a deliverable and methods should indicated how data will be captured, i.e., for focus groups USAID requires a transcript. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Comparison – to baselines, plans/targets, or to other standards or norms [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Explanation – for questions that ask “why” or about the attribution of an effect to a specific intervention (causality) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)