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| This document provides supplemental guidance to [ADS 201.3.6.7](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) and [ADS 201mab](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201mab). It is a template for developing an evaluation Statement of Work (SOW). The first section provides an overview of the major components of an evaluation SOW. The second section provides some suggested language as well as more detailed guidance and considerations for writing an SOW to best fit your operating unit’s needs.  The body of the template includes suggested text, with customizable items indicated within brackets. The dark gray highlighted text and light gray boxes provide instructions and tips, respectively. These guides are intended to help you think through writing your SOW. Before completing your SOW, be sure to adapt or replace text as appropriate to meet your evaluation’s needs, fill in any remaining customizable text, and delete all highlighted text and text boxes.  If you or your Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Specialist would like **additional support for evaluation concerns**, technical assistance is available through your USAID/Washington regional or pillar bureau M&E points of contact (POCs) ([contact directly](https://programnet.usaid.gov/library/me-pocs-list)) and the Evaluation Team in the Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning’s Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research ([mande@usaid.gov](mailto:mande@usaid.gov)). |

**Section One: Statement of Work Template - Overview**

**EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK TEMPLATE**
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**Section Two: Statement of Work Template - Detailed Guidance**

**STATEMENT OF WORK**

*[Type of evaluation, e.g., performance or impact evaluation]***of** *[Name of strategy/project/activity]*

# Purpose of the Evaluation

**Instructions: Insert why the evaluation is being conducted (the purpose), who will use the results of the evaluation, and how they will use it.**

**Tips:** Note that the Contracting Officer (CO) will often copy the purpose statement and add it to the contract that is ultimately executed. Therefore, the purpose is included first in this template. If preferred, the purpose can also come after the Background Section (Section III).

The purpose needs to link the evaluation to any key decisions to be made by USAID leadership, partner governments, relevant local non-governmental institutions, organizations and communities, or other key stakeholders. The purpose should define the evaluation’s objectives and be consistent with, but not replicate, the evaluation questions (see Section IV and [ADS 201saf, Evaluation Triggers](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201saf)). The clearer the purpose, the more likely the evaluation will produce credible and useful findings and conclusions.

Some issues to consider as you write the purpose:

* Is this the only evaluation that will be conducted, or is it one in a series? Give relevant context, e.g., "Given that this activity is still in an early stage of implementation, this first evaluation will set the groundwork for later evaluations. The purpose of this evaluation is..."
* How does the timing of the evaluation tie into the purpose? For example: "This mid-term evaluation will inform mid-course corrective actions” or “With this final evaluation, the Mission intends to capture emerging results to inform decisions about current and future programming."
* Who are the audiences for the evaluation? The audiences should be made explicit to help offerors contextualize the purpose and intended use of the evaluation. If there is more than one audience, identify the primary, secondary, etc.
* How does the evaluation contribute to a larger body of evidence or fill specific evidence gaps? Considerations include how the evaluation may:
  + Link to Mission, technical office, or project Learning Agenda and MEL Plans;
  + Relate to other sources of data such as other planned, ongoing, or completed evaluations, monitoring data, and other assessments and information gathering efforts; and
  + Contribute to learning and evidence priorities of relevant local institutions and organizations, including those of the partner country government.

# Summary Information

**Instructions: Summarize basic information on the strategy/project/activity being evaluated.** Adapt one of the two suggested formats on the next page:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strategy/Project/Activity Name(s) | [Name of strategy/project/activity(ies) being evaluated] |
| USAID Office(s) | [Name of the office in the Mission/Washington Operating Unit (OU) that is managing the evaluation] |
| Implementer(s) | [Prime implementing partner. If multiple implementers, include prime(s) and all sub-primes] |
| Cooperative Agreement/Contract # | [Agreement or Contract Number(s)] |
| Total Estimated Ceiling of the Evaluated Project/Activity (TEC) | [Total estimated cost] |
| Life of Strategy/Project/Activity | [Start to end month and year, e.g., April 2018-May 2021, for each] |
| Active Geographic Regions | [Geographic regions covered by the intervention. Report using lowest implementing unit. For example, say 100 villages across 5 districts, not just 5 districts. If relevant, specific geographic areas you would like to focus on] |
| Development Objective(s) (DOs) | [Number and name of the DO that this evaluation relates to] |
| Required evaluation? | *[Does the evaluation meet requirements under* [ADS 201.3.](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201)6.5*? Yes/No]* |
| External or internal evaluation? | [External/internal] |

# Background

**Instructions:** Complete the sub-sections below to **provide a detailed description of the context, history, goals and objectives, and current status of the strategy/project/activity to be evaluated,** as well as other relevant information.

## Description of the Problem and Context

**Instructions: Include details that help the reader understand the broader** context in which the strategy/project/activity to be evaluated operates.

**Tips:**

Include the:

* Problem;
* Context;
* Broader target population;
* Specific problem or opportunity the strategy/project/activity to be evaluated was designed to address;
* Any changes in context since the original design, if applicable; and
* Decision-makers in the design process besides USAID (interagency, local actors, host country counterparts, private sector partners, etc.).

Include in the body of the document or attach as an annex:

* Problem/context analysis used during design; and
* Mission Results Framework.

## Description of the Intervention to be Evaluated and Theory of Change

**Instructions:** Provide information to help the reader develop a strong understanding of the strategy/project/activity to be evaluated, particularly the **primary interventions, strategic approaches, or tasks** implemented by the strategy/project/activity.

**Tips:** This section should provide more specific information than section III.A above, without unnecessary repetition. Make sure to address:

The target population;

The theory of change;

Activities (if evaluating a project);

Actions or workstreams (if evaluating an activity);

Outputs or deliverables;

Desired short-term and long-term outcomes;

Summary of any substantive modifications in the implementation plan, and when changes were effective; and

Which aspects of the strategy/project/activity are intended to be sustained beyond the end of this assistance, by whom, and with what resources.

Include or attach as an annex, as available and applicable:

Maps to describe geographic area(s) of operation and/or target populations;

[Project Logic Model](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/how-note-developing-project-logic-model-and-its-associated-theory-change) highlighting the elements to be evaluated;

Activity Logic Model showing linkages to the project level;

Project Implementation Plan (Activity Plan); and

Activity Implementation Plan (Action/Work Plans).

**If this SOW is for an impact evaluation, consult your M&E specialist for guidance before completing this section.** Provide as much detail as possible regarding the:

Extent to which the evaluation team will provide input to the activity’s design and implementation;

Level of the intervention (e.g., region/community/clinic/doctor);

Strategy for recruitment, targeting, and identification of beneficiaries;

Real/expected size of beneficiary population; and

Expected uptake/dropout of beneficiaries (if applicable).

## Project or Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plan

**Instructions:** **Describe relevant information and data collection** included within the Project MEL Plan and Activity MEL Plan(s), **and specify what documents will be available to the evaluators**. Identify the existence and availability of information and data sources related to performance and effectiveness information, such as performance/context/outcome monitoring indicators or previous evaluation reports. In addition, identify any other documents or sources of data from outside USAID that would be useful to the evaluation team (e.g., government or international data).

# Evaluation Questions

**Tips:** **For ease of reading, this section may instead be included in an annex.** Note that data sources are additionally relevant to Section V, Evaluation Design and Methodology. Share as much relevant program documentation as is appropriate by providing links, excerpts, or annexes to help readers understand the level and kinds of information that will be available.

Examples of helpful information include:

Program information on the [Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC)](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/submitting-usaid-evaluation-development-experience-clearinghouse-dec), such as annual reports and evaluations;

Performance reports, assessments, or studies;

[Project MEL Plan](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/cleared_-_how-to_note_-_project_mel_plan_r.pdf) and/or [Activity MEL Plan](https://www.usaid.gov/project-starter/program-cycle/activity-design/activity-monitor), or excerpts;

[Learning Agenda](https://usaidlearninglab.org/qrg/learning-agenda), or excerpts;

Project or activity websites; and

[Data Quality Assessments](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/how-note-conducting-data-quality-assessment-dqa).

For [MEL platforms](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/discussion-note-designing-mel-platforms), you may find there is additional information that can be shared, such as on existing data systems, monitoring data and reporting processes, and learning activities.

Evaluators will review and finalize questions in collaboration with USAID prior to finalizing the evaluation design.

**Instructions**: **List** **1-5 specific questions** focused on key program areas and/or performance and **directly link to the purpose of the evaluation and its expected use**. List these questions in order of priority, or otherwise indicate. Include sub-questions or narrative text only to elaborate on the main question, not to add new lines of inquiry.

**Tips:** Note that not every aspect of the strategy/project/activity needs to be evaluated. The evaluation should examine those aspects where there are questions unanswered by monitoring or other kinds of data. See the Evaluation Toolkit for [Tips for Developing Good Evaluation Questions (Performance Evaluations](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/tips-developing-good-evaluation-questions-0)).

Questions should:

* **Be precise.** Vague terms (e.g., “sustainability,” “effectiveness,” “relevance,” etc.) should be defined. If applicable, include any criteria or sources you use to define the term (such as a particular index your project uses to determine “sustainability”). If you do not provide a definition or criteria, the evaluation team will define the term for you, and their definition may not match your understanding.
* **Be researchable.** Questions should have an answer that can be obtained through the use of social science methods and tools (qualitative and quantitative). Consider whether the evaluation team could collect this information with the time and budget allocated.
* **Integrate gender.** Questions should identify when disaggregated data are expected. Where appropriate, the evaluation questions can include a separate question to evaluate the gender-specific effects of the activity or project. See the [Evaluation Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation-toolkit) for the [How-To Note on Engendering Evaluation](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/how-note-engendering-evaluation-usaid).
* **Be actionable.** Picture the findings you expect from these questions. How would you use them? Would they be helpful? How do they relate to the evaluation purpose and intended use? You will want the findings and conclusions to help USAID respond to knowledge and decision-making needs. Consider a simulation of use exercise to help you think through ultimate use of information.
* **Be listed in order of priority (or otherwise indicate).** Articulating priorities helps prepare USAID to select the most suitable proposal during the procurement process and helps the evaluation team understand and respond to USAID information needs.
* ***Note that a request for recommendations or lessons learned is not an evaluation question.*** Recommendations are optional in evaluations. External evaluators alone cannot provide recommendations that are appropriate in the USAID operating context; USAID staff are best equipped to provide the understanding and perspective that make recommendations relevant and actionable. If you want the evaluators to provide recommendations, be sure to request so within Sections VI (Deliverables) and X (Final Report) and address how recommendations will be developed.

**For impact evaluation questions, consult your M&E specialist prior to drafting this section.** These questions require specific, specialized consideration.

In impact evaluations, questions often take the form of:

* What is the impact of [intervention] on [outcome(s)] among [target beneficiaries/communities/geographic area(s)] compared to [those involved in another intervention/approach or a control group]?
* What is the relative cost effectiveness of [intervention 1] compared to [intervention 2]?

Sub-questions or narratives can specify a sub-group that should be included in the analysis. Impact evaluations can also include performance evaluation questions.

# Evaluation Design and Methodology

**Instructions: Confirm whether the evaluation is a performance or impact evaluation and address design expectations.** (See also [ADS 201.3.6.2, Principles of Evaluation](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/201.pdf).)

**Tips:** **Include suggestions or illustrative descriptions** about the methodology for the evaluation. If you have experience in methodology and methods, this section can include specifics such as recommended data-collection-plans or instruments evaluators can use. If you have a particular instrument you want the evaluators to use or develop, you can request it here. **Otherwise, request the offeror’s expertise** to propose appropriate methodology and to further refine proposed methods during the evaluation design phase. Note that major changes to methods following award could have contractual implications.

If possible, describe:

Any existing [baselines](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/performance-indicator-baselines) that may be relevant in data analysis;

Suggested data collection methods for data types associated with evaluation questions. Include suggestions only if you feel qualified to determine the most adequate methods to answer the evaluation question(s), otherwise, request these suggestions from the offeror;

Suggested primary and secondary data sources. Specify whether there are expectations regarding variables that should be measured;

Whether performance monitoring data are to be used and the quality of the data. If the data have not been verified, state whether it is the expectation that the proposed design should include this verification.

Any limitations to the existing secondary data or contextual challenges to the collection of new data;

Sites or groups to be visited for data collection:

Preliminary list of interviewees/survey participants/focus group discussants [do *not* include personally identifiable information (PII)].

Draft data collection instruments and guides, if applicable;

How the evaluation data collected should be analyzed (e.g., comparison of particular groups or precision of response criteria, such as “margin of error must be less than +/- 10 percent”) and any limitations of the proposed study design. Suggest this only if you are qualified to do so, otherwise, request these methodological details from the offeror; and

When analysis of disaggregated data is needed (e.g., sex, age, geography, or other relevant aspects of beneficiaries).

**Tips**: The below design matrix can be included as a summary of evaluation design and methods but should not replace the narrative. When drafting this matrix, be as specific as possible in the details, if you feel qualified to do so, for example by naming which national statistics dataset should be used. You may also provide a draft matrix and request the offerors to propose a more complete version to be finalized along with the evaluation design and in collaboration with USAID.

Include any data sources that do not need to be collected but can be analyzed by the evaluation team. In planning for and preparing the evaluation SOW it is a good practice to review existing data that have already been collected, especially performance monitoring data. For more information on analyzing performance monitoring data, see the [Monitoring Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/monitoring-toolkit).

The evaluation team, in collaboration with USAID, will finalize the evaluation methods before fieldwork begins.

USAID expects that, at a minimum, the evaluation team will:

* Upon award, familiarize themselves with documentation about the project and USAID’s current assistance in the [e.g., Economic Growth, Democracy and Governance, Health] area in the region. USAID will ensure that this documentation is available to the team prior to their arrival in the region;
* Review and assess the existing performance and effectiveness information or data;
* Conduct site visits for field testing survey instruments (when applicable and feasible);
* Meet and interview USAID project beneficiaries, partners, and host government counterparts at appropriate levels (when applicable);
* Interview USAID staff and a representative number of experts working in the sector; and
* Spend approximately [amount of time] in the region carrying out this SOW.

The desk review includes at a minimum:

* USAID [project/activity] SOW;
* [Strategy/project/activity] materials: Annual and Quarterly Reports, Annual Work Plan, MEL Plans, sector assessments, trip reports, performance reports, gender analyses, relevant sections of the Project Appraisal Document, and miscellaneous thematic reports from other sources.

The contractor will submit the preliminary evaluation design in response to the [*Request for Task Order Proposal (RFTOP), Request for Proposal (RFP)*] for review by USAID. The evaluation Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) will approve the finalized evaluation design two weeks or more prior to the team’s arrival in country.

The evaluation design matrix should include a data analysis plan for each evaluation question. Requests of the offeror can include explicit description of major limitations in data collection and analysis.

**Evaluation Design Matrix** *Optional*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Suggested Data Sources | Suggested Data Collection Methods | Suggested Data Analysis Methods |
| 1.[Evaluation Question] |  |  |  |
| 2. [Evaluation Question] |  |  |  |
| 3. [Evaluation Question] |  |  |  |

# Deliverables and Reporting Requirements

**Instructions**: **List specific deliverables, reporting requirements, audiences, and timeframes the evaluation team should know.** The only required deliverables are the evaluation design, draft report, and final report. Additional deliverables may be beneficial; some suggestions for optional deliverables are described below.

Note that contract or agreement types vary in implications for timing and flexibility. The mechanism under which you are procuring this evaluation may affect the content and structure of this and subsequent sections. **Please contact the AOR/COR and/or AO/CO to confirm the appropriate content given the mechanism you are using, especially if you are using a buy-in mechanism or are procuring the evaluation under a** [MEL platform](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/discussion-note-designing-mel-platforms)**.**

The following list of required, recommended, and optional deliverables presents draft language to describe evaluation deliverables you are requesting in the SOW. **Please modify the text to suit your evaluation needs.**

**Tips**: Note that each optional deliverable will add to the overall timeline to complete the evaluation. **Consider the time needed for the evaluation team to reasonably complete each deliverable, including travel and rest time.** The people on the evaluation team cannot complete their deliverables as requested when USAID sets unrealistic expectations or does not complete its obligations as it states it will. Take into account sequencing, logistical challenges, Mission schedules, local holidays, and USAID response times for tasks like reviewing and clearing deliverables. Be sure to consider timelines and sequences forward and backward—give appropriate time for the team to prepare and execute. For example, data analysis occurs in preparation for the draft report, so the exit-briefing for an international team will not include final presentation of findings.

Note that the work plan may include the evaluation design (a requirement of all evaluations), or it may be separate. It is not always feasible to complete an evaluation design immediately upon award, and it can take weeks to develop a good design and prepare data collection instruments that are participatory, utilization-focused, and incorporate all the existing data.

If USAID staff are expected to participate in the evaluation or observe any aspect of it, include expectations for collaboration and coordination here, making clear contractor and USAID responsibilities.

**For impact evaluations**, consult your M&E Specialist and the COR/AOR of the activity to be evaluated. There is special coordination that must happen between the USAID teams commissioning the impact evaluation, those managing the activity, the evaluation contractor, and the IP, to ensure that an impact evaluation will be feasible**. This coordination requires intentional collaboration points and deliverables to** **be written into and managed for** **both the evaluation and activity contracts / grants**, including who will be responsible for managing this collaboration over the life of the evaluation (i.e., the CORs/AORs of the evaluation and of the activity being evaluated).

1. **Evaluation Work Plan**: *Recommended*

Within [*number*] weeks of the award of the contract, the lead evaluator shall complete and present a draft work plan for the evaluation to the AOR/COR.

The work plan will include:

1. Draft schedule and logistical arrangements;
2. Members of the evaluation team, delineated by roles and responsibilities;
3. Evaluation milestones;
4. Anticipated schedule of evaluation team data collection efforts;
5. Locations and dates for piloting data collection efforts, if applicable;
6. Proposed evaluation methodology including selection criteria for comparison groups, if applicable; and
7. Evaluation Report outline (if different from the attached template).

The contractor will update the evaluation work plan (the lists of interviewees, survey participants, the schedule) and submit the updated version to the AOR/COR on a [*weekly/biweekly/etc.*] basis.

1. **Evaluation Design**: *Required*

Within [*number*] weeks of approval of the work plan, the evaluation team must submit an evaluation design to the AOR/COR. The design will become an annex to the evaluation report.

The evaluation design will include:

* Detailed evaluation design matrix that links the Evaluation Questions from the SOW (in their finalized form) to data sources, methods, and the data analysis plan;
* Draft questionnaires and other data collection instruments or their main features;
* List of potential interviewees and sites to be visited and proposed selection criteria and/or sampling plan (must include sampling methodology and methods, including a justification of sample size and any applicable calculations);
* Limitations to the evaluation design; and
* Dissemination plan (designed in collaboration with USAID).

**Tips: For impact evaluations**, **the evaluation design may depend on an intervention being implemented in a particular way**, such as increased recruitment followed by a selection of potential beneficiaries into treatment and control groups. Deliverables could include conversations with implementing partners prior to finalizing the evaluation design.

Unless exempted from doing so by the AOR/COR, the evaluation design will be shared with partner country stakeholders as well as with the implementing partners for comment before being finalized.

The data analysis plan should clearly describe the evaluation team’s approach for analyzing quantitative and qualitative data (as applicable), including proposed sample sizes, specific data analysis tools, and any software proposed to be used, with an explanation of how/why these selections will be useful in answering the evaluation questions for this task. Qualitative data should be coded as part of the analysis approach, and the coding used should be included in the appendix of the final report. Gender, geographic, and role (beneficiary, implementer, government official, NGO, etc.) disaggregation must be included in the data analysis where applicable.

All dissemination plans should be developed with USAID and include information on audiences, activities, and deliverables, including any data visualizations, multimedia products, or events to help communicate evaluation [*findings/conclusions/recommendations].* See the [Evaluation Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation-toolkit) for guidance on [Developing an Evaluation Dissemination Plan.](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/developing-evaluation-dissemination-plan-0)

If applicable based on the [Disclosure of Conflict of Interests Forms](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/sample-disclosure-conflict-interest-form) submitted with the awardee’s proposal, the evaluation design will include a conflict of interest mitigation plan.

USAID offices and relevant stakeholders are asked to take up to [*number*] working days to review and consolidate comments through the AOR/COR. Once the evaluation team receives the consolidated comments on the initial evaluation design and work plan, they are expected to return with a revised evaluation design and work plan within [*number*] working days.

**Tips:** The design should be reviewed and approved by USAID and clear any local relevant IRB procedures before the evaluation team begins data collection (including testing, training, and piloting), or at a minimum within a period of time when it is still possible to change data collection methods.

1. **In-Briefing**: *Optional*

Within [*number*] working days of arrival in [*location*], the evaluation team will meet with the [*offices/audiences*] for introductions and to discuss the team’s understanding of the assignment, initial assumptions, evaluation questions, methodology, and work plan, and/or to adjust the SOW, if necessary.

1. **Inception Report**: *Optional*

The evaluation team will present findings from the desk review and/or examination of data to date.

1. **Mid-term Briefing and Interim Meetings**: *Optional*

The evaluation team is expected to hold a mid-term briefing with [*names of USAID offices and staff*] on the status of the evaluation, including potential challenges and emerging opportunities. The team will also provide the evaluation AOR/COR with periodic briefings and feedback on the team’s findings, as agreed upon during the in-briefing. If desired or necessary, weekly briefings by phone can be arranged.

1. **Final Exit Briefing**: *Optional*

The evaluation team is expected to hold a final exit briefing to discuss the status of data collection and preliminary findings. This presentation will be scheduled as agreed upon during the in-briefing.

**Tips:** Specify any guidelines for the presentation, e.g., preferred medium, participants (including relevant internal and external stakeholders), joint or separate briefings, and expected maximum length.

1. **Preliminary [*Presentation/Workshop*] for Recommendations Development**: *Optional*

The evaluation team is expected to hold a preliminary [*presentation/workshop*] *[in person/by virtual conferencing software*] to discuss the summary of findings and conclusions with USAID and to draft collaboratively any requested recommendations. Any presentations or workshops will be scheduled as agreed upon during the in-briefing.

**Tips:** Within the evaluation report, findings and conclusions are standard but recommendations are optional. If you do request recommendations, they should be **based on findings and conclusions and developed in collaboration with USAID** in order to ensure the most relevant and feasible recommendations possible. For an example of this kind of collaboration, see the Recommendations Co-Creation Session in [Collaborating for Better Evaluation Recommendations](https://usaidlearninglab.org/lab-notes/no-one-can-know-everything-collaborating-better-evaluation-recommendations).

However you choose to structure this deliverable, specify its guidelines, e.g., timing, preferred medium, participants (including internal and any external stakeholders), expected maximum length, and expected outputs. You may, for example, want to request a **Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations table** to be drafted during this meeting for ultimate inclusion in the final evaluation report.

As always, take care to be realistic about USAID and stakeholder timelines for participation, review, and input.

1. **Final Presentation**: *Optional*

The evaluation team is expected to hold a final presentation [*in person/by virtual conferencing software*] to discuss the summary of findings and conclusions (and recommendations, if applicable) with USAID. This presentation will be scheduled as agreed upon during the in-briefing.

**Tips:** Specify guidelines of the presentation, e.g., timing (before or after the final report), preferred medium, participants (including relevant internal and external stakeholders), joint or separate briefings, and expected maximum length.

1. **Draft Evaluation Report**: *Required*

The draft evaluation report should be consistent with the guidance provided in Section IX, Final Report Format. The report will address each of the questions identified in the SOW and any other issues the team considers to have a bearing on the objectives of the evaluation. Any such issues can be included in the report only after consultation with USAID. The submission datefor the draft evaluation report will be determined in the evaluation work plan.Once the initial draft evaluation report is submitted, [*office(s)*] will have [*number*] working days in which to review and comment on the initial draft, after which point the AOR/COR will submit the consolidated comments to the evaluation team. The evaluation team will then be asked to submit a revised final draft report within [*number*] working days, and again the [*office(s)*] will review and send comments on this final draft report within [*number*]of its submission.

Tips: A good practice is for the evaluation team to share an early draft or detailed outline that includes main findings and bullets before finalizing the draft evaluation report. See the [Evaluation Toolkit for Additional Help on Managing the Peer Review of a Draft Evaluation Report](https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/201sai_managing_the_peer_review_of_a_draft_evaluation_report_sept_2016.pdf).

1. **Final Evaluation Report**: *Required*

The evaluation team will be asked to take no more than [*number*] working days (or as agreed upon in the work plan)to respond to and incorporate final draft evaluation report [*and presentations/workshops*] comments from [*office(s)*]. The evaluation team lead will then submit the final report to the AOR/COR.

**Tips:** Remember that the audience(s) for the evaluation should determine how the final product is structured and presented. For example, if a primary audience is the host government, then the executive summary should be translated into the local official language(s), and there should be consideration for an appropriate communication product to be shared (e.g., one-pager, videos, data visualizations, etc.).

**Tips:** List the Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations table, if applicable. List any additional deliverables, such as communications products specified in your dissemination plan. If a key audience is a non-governmental institution, organization, or community, develop communication products in an appropriate local language to make findings available to that audience(s) (e.g., posters, technical summaries, pamphlets, public presentations, additional visualizations, etc.).

1. **Other Evaluation Deliverables**: *Optional*
2. **Submission of Dataset(s) to the Development Data Library**:

Per USAID’s Open Data policy (see[ADS 579, USAID Development Data](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/500/579)) the contractor must also submit to the AOR/COR and the Development Data Library (DDL), at [www.usaid.gov/data](https://www.usaid.gov/data), in a machine-readable, non-proprietary format, a copy of any dataset created or obtained in performance of this award, if applicable. The dataset should be organized and documented for use by those not fully familiar with the intervention or evaluation.

Please review [ADS 579.3.3.2 Types of Data To Be Submitted to the DDL](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/500/579) to determine applicability.

1. **Submission of Final Evaluation Report to the Development Experience Clearinghouse**: *Required*

Per USAID policy ([ADS 201.3.6.9](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201)) the contractor must submit the evaluation final report and its summary or summaries to the [Development Experience Clearinghouse](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/home/Default.aspx) (DEC) within three months of final approval by USAID.

# Evaluation Team Composition

**Instructions**: **Before** the suggested language offered below, describe the intended size of the evaluation team and the appropriate expertise related to evaluation approaches (or methodologies), methods, and subject matter required of the team or specific team members.

**Tips:** In addition to your description of the evaluation team, adapt the suggested language below to suit the needs of your evaluation. Make clear which qualifications and skills are necessary for the evaluation team lead, and which may be held by anyone on the team. Also make clear which qualifications and skills are required, and which are desired.Quantify where you can, such as providing the minimum expected years of relevant experience. Strive to provide clear expectations while avoiding unrealistic or overly restrictive criteria. Your careful consideration helps offerors recruit and compile the team most likely to be able to meet your needs and expectations.

Additionally:

A typical team should include one team leader who will serve as the primary coordinator with USAID;

At least one team member should be an evaluation specialist;

**The recruitment of local evaluators is highly encouraged**. Per [ADS 201.3.6.8](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201), to the extent possible, evaluation specialists with appropriate expertise from partner countries, but not involved in project implementation, will lead and/or be included in evaluation teams; and

If there is a conflict of interest for any team member, you may request a mitigation plan from the offeror and include a copy with the [conflict of interest forms](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/sample-disclosure-conflict-interest-form) in the final report.

The contractor must provide information about evaluation team members, including their curricula vitae, and explain how they meet the requirements in the evaluation SOW. Submissions of writing samples or links to past evaluation reports and related deliverables composed by proposed team members are highly desirable. Per [ADS 201.3.6.8](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201), all team members must provide to USAID a signed statement attesting to a lack of conflict of interest or describing an existing conflict of interest relative to the project or activity being evaluated (i.e., a conflict of interest form).

Required qualifications and skills:

1. Experience in evaluation design, methods, management, and implementation;
2. Technical subject matter expertise;
3. Background in USAID’s cross-cutting program priorities, such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, youth, etc.;
4. *[Regional or country]* experience; and
5. *[Local language]* skills.

Proposed key personnel are expected to be the people who execute the work of this contract. Any substitutes to the proposed key personnel must be vetted and approved by the AOR/COR before they begin work. USAID may request an interview with any of the proposed evaluation team members via conference call, video conference, or other means.

The expected roles and responsibilities of the impact evaluation team vis-a-vis the implementing partner are *[describe roles]*.

Optional, Impact Evaluations:

The evaluation AOR/COR may observe [*all/some*] of the data collection efforts. USAID may also delegate one or more staff members to work full-time with the evaluation team or to participate in selected evaluation activities. The evaluation AOR/COR will inform the contractor in writing about any full-time or part-time USAID delegates no later than [*number of days*] working days after the submission of a [*draft/updated*] evaluation work plan. USAID will pre-define any staff’s level of involvement by indicating the purpose of their inclusion, their role on the team and in which components of the evaluation they will participate, their expertise in the topic or sector, and their expertise in evaluation design or implementation. USAID maintains primary responsibility for management of its own staff. USAID will outline collaboration, delivery, and performance expectations for its staff as well as reporting lines and how staff management roles and responsibilities will be coordinated between USAID, the contractor, and the evaluation team lead. This plan will be finalized in consultation with the contractor and the evaluation team lead, with final approval by the AOR/COR, to ensure it is feasible and appropriate to the evaluation objectives and [*name of OU’s*] needs and that it addresses mitigation of risk of impeding evaluation implementation or biasing findings. All costs associated with the participation of full-time or part-time USAID delegates in the evaluation will be the responsibility of USAID.

# Evaluation Schedule

The below evaluation schedule is illustrative and will be updated in collaboration with USAID prior to finalization of the work plan.

**Instructions**: Provide the period of performance – **a start date and** **timeframe (in days)** for the evaluation. The period of performance is inclusive and should incorporate the estimated time needed for USAID to complete its responsibilities and tasks, such as review of the draft and final evaluation reports, review and approval of intermediate deliverables, and meeting participation.

In addition to the period of performance, **include illustrative information about the level of effort** (LOE), or work days, for the evaluation team to complete the evaluation. Requirements for levels of effort are determined by the contracting mechanisms. The level of effort is not the same as the period of performance, as it focuses on the evaluation team’s work time only.

**Tips:** It is important that the evaluation schedule includes time for review with key stakeholders and USAID staff at all relevant stages. Pay attention to level of effort required for all involved parties, as well as factors that may delay timing. Be as realistic as possible. Consider including a table or schedule in narrative form. An example table is provided in the following section.

As you build your timeline, consider:

How long do you expect the evaluation team to take to review documents and become familiar with the program prior to travel?

How long will it take to get the necessary clearances for travel, to complete any protocols to visit communities, and to prepare for data collection?

How many sites will the team be expected to visit, and what is a realistic timeframe for such requirements? Will the team be split up into smaller units during data collection to speed up the time required to collect the data?

How long will it take to collect data?

How long will it take to analyze data?

How long will it take to prepare briefings, reports, and communications products?

What additional time will be required to prepare for and deliver additional deliverables, especially planning for workshops that require USAID participation?

Will translation be necessary at any point in the process?

For **impact evaluations,** consider adding a scoping trip to the timeline as a recommended step before a design report.

**Performance Evaluation *Sample Format* Schedule**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date or Duration | Proposed Activities | *[Important Considerations]* |
|  | Preparation of the work plan and evaluation design | [Local holidays, season/weather, transport availability] |
|  | USAID review of the work plan and evaluation design | [Availability in the Mission or OU] |
|  | Travel and preparations for data collection | [Visa requirements] |
|  | In-briefing | [Availability in the Mission or OU] |
|  | Data collection | [Number of sites, methods, sectors, etc.] |
|  | Data analysis | [Amount and type of data] |
|  | Report writing | [Length of time to meet report requirements and any additional requests/products] |
|  | USAID review of draft report | [Length of time for all relevant stakeholders to read and provide feedback] |
|  | Incorporate USAID comments and prepare final report | [Length of time to reconcile feedback from varying stakeholders and comply with formatting requirements] |
|  | Submit dataset(s) to Development Data Library | [Length of time to convert data to machine-readable format] |
|  | Submit final report to Development Experience Clearinghouse | [Length of time for final review and approval by AOR/COR] |

**Tips:** To help you draft LOE expectations, see the Evaluation [Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation-toolkit) for guidance on [Developing an Independent Government Cost Estimate for a Performance Evaluation](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/developing-independent-government-cost-estimate-performance-evaluation).

For all stages of the evaluation, **consider the time necessary not only for completion, but also for quality of process and product**. An exhausted team may be able to complete deliverables on a tight timeline, but rushed work generally sacrifices quality in terms of accuracy or utility of the final product.

Key factors for determining LOE include:

**Planning/Evaluation Design**: How many documents are there to review and how many methods of data collection are anticipated? Time is required to review the documentation, prepare a work plan, and design instruments. Each method of data collection will require its own instrument.

**Preparations for Data Collection**: Is the team located out of country? How long does travel planning and travel take? Are there visa or other considerations to account for? How much travel is required within country? How will the team travel? Will they require security escort?

**Data Collection Logistics and Timing**: How many different geographic locations will be required? How many people will travel to each location, and for how many days? What level of participation or support will be required from the implementing partner? Could the data collection timeline conflict with national or local holidays, religious events, or events that may affect the availability of implementing partners?

**Analysis**: How many different types of data sets are going to be generated? Allocate time for data entry and cleaning.

**Reporting and Briefing**: How many different deliverables are required? Allocate time by deliverable and by person (not all team members will spend the same amount of time on each deliverable).

The following two sample tables are illustrative for a **simple evaluation** with four team members. Take care when copying tables - however you choose to present your LOE, **make sure the information is accurate to your best estimate of the particular needs of your evaluation**. This information is key in helping offerors better understand work time expectations and cost implications for managing the evaluation team - and is an opportunity for your team to align on expectations, helping avoid costly or inefficient workplan changes later on.

**Sample Format A: Estimated LOE in days by activity for a team of [*number*]**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task | LOE for Team Lead | LOE for [*subject matter*] Specialist | LOE for [*subject matter*] Specialist | LOE for [*subject matter*] Specialist | Total LOE in days |
| Document review/desk review/work planning and evaluation designdrafting |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparations for travel and organizing data collection (contracting translators, vehicles, etc.). |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-brief, evaluation design finalization (including meetings with USAID) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparations for data collection (scheduling) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection days by method by site |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Briefing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations workshop |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft report and debrief to USAID (including any applicable time for translation) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final report |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |

**Sample Format B: Estimated LOE in days by position for a team of [*number*]**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Position | Preparation | Travel to/from Country | In-Country Data Collection | Finalization of Report | Total LOE in days |
| Team Lead (indicate if evaluation specialist) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialist |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialist |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialist |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |

# Final Report Format

1. Abstract
2. Executive Summary
3. Evaluation Purpose
4. Background on the Context and the Strategies/Projects/Activities being Evaluated
5. Evaluation Questions
6. Methodology
7. Limitations to the Evaluation
8. Findings, Conclusions, and (If Applicable) Recommendations
9. Annexes

See the [Evaluation Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation-toolkit) for the [How-To Note on Preparing Evaluation Reports](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/how-note-preparing-evaluation-reports) and [ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201mah). An optional [Evaluation Report Template](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/evaluation-report-template) is also available in the Evaluation Toolkit.

The evaluation **abstract of no more than 250 words** should describe what was evaluated, evaluation questions, methods, and key findings or conclusions. The **executive summary should be 2–5 pages** and summarize the purpose, background of the project being evaluated, main evaluation questions, methods, findings, and conclusions (plus recommendations and lessons learned, if applicable). The evaluation methodology shall be explained in the report in detail. Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methods (e.g., in sampling; data availability; measurement; analysis; any potential bias such as sampling/selection, measurement, interviewer, response, etc.) and their implications for conclusions drawn from the evaluation findings.

Annexes to the report must include:

* Evaluation SOW (updated, not the original, if there were any modifications);
* Evaluation methods;
* All data collection and analysis tools used in conducting the evaluation, such as questionnaires, checklists, and discussion guides;
* All sources of information or data, identified and listed;
* Statements of difference regarding significant unresolved differences of opinion by funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation team, if applicable;
* [Signed disclosure of conflict of interest forms](http://usaidlearninglab.org/library/sample-disclosure-conflict-interest-form) for all evaluation team members, either attesting to a lack of or describing existing conflicts of interest; and
* Summary information about evaluation team members, including qualifications, experience, and role on the team.
* Evaluation data or link to data.

# Critertia to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation

Per [ADS 201maa, Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201maa), draft and final evaluation reports will be evaluated against the following criteria to ensure quality.

* Evaluations must have the required sections outlined in [ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201mah).
* Evaluation reports should represent a thoughtful, well-researched, and well-organized effort to objectively evaluate the subject of the evaluation (e.g., strategy, project, activity).
* Evaluation reports should use clear language per the [USAID Style Guide](https://www.usaid.gov/work-usaid/style-guide).
* Evaluation reports should adequately address all evaluation questions included in the statement of work, or the evaluation questions subsequently revised and documented in consultation and agreement with USAID.
* According to the [ADS 201.3.6.2](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) principle that evaluations should be based on the best methods of appropriate rigor, evaluations must produce well documented findings that are verifiable, reproducible, and on which stakeholders can confidently rely, while providing clear explanations of limitations. Evaluation methodology should be explained in detail and sources of information properly identified. Sufficient information on methodology and data collection should be included to allow for stakeholders to make informed judgements about the quality and accuracy the findings, and to allow other evaluators to replicate the protocol.
* In support of [ADS 201.3.6.2](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) principle that evaluations should be independent, objective, and unbiased in measuring and reporting, limitations to the evaluation should be adequately disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.). Evaluators should strive for objectivity in the planning and conduct of evaluations and in the interpretation and dissemination of findings, avoiding conflicts of interest, bias, and other partiality.
* Evaluation reports should adequately capture the situations and experiences of both males and females. If evaluation findings or data include people-level indicators they must be disaggregated by sex. For more information, see [How-To Note: Engendering Evaluation at USAID](https://programnet.usaid.gov/resource/how-note-engendering-evaluation-usaid).
* Findings, conclusions, and recommendations (if any) should be specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative and/or qualitative evidence.
* Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence, and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay, or simply the compilation of people’s opinions.
* Conclusions should clearly be based on the evaluation findings.

If recommendations are included, they should be supported by a specific set of referenced findings, and should be prioritized, action-oriented, practical, and specific. To support the [ADS 201.3.6.2](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) evaluation principle that evaluations should be oriented to reinforcing local ownership, when possible, evaluators should include relevant local stakeholders in joint development of recommendations. See [ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements](https://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201mah) and the [Evaluation Report Checklist and Review Template](https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/evaluation-report-checklist-and-review-template) from the [Evaluation Toolkit](https://usaidlearninglab.org/evaluation-toolkit) for additional guidance.

# Other Requirements *Optional*

All modifications to the required elements of the SOW of the contract/agreement, whether in evaluation questions, design and methodology, deliverables and reporting, evaluation team composition, schedule, and/or other requirementswill be agreed upon in writing by the AOR/COR. Any revisions made will be noted in the SOW annexed to the final Evaluation Report.

# List of Annexes

**Instructions**: **Provide a list of the annexes you will attach to the SOW.** Include all annexes promised in earlier sections, as well as anything additional you thinkwill help the offeror design a strong proposal.