

CHECKLIST FOR IMPACT EVALUATION PLANNING

This checklist is a tool for evaluation focal persons and EVAL officials to appraise the quality of impact evaluation plans and proposals. It can also serve as guidance to the impact evaluation designer and those approving the design.

Revised February 18, 2014

RATING

Rating dimensions

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 0 = None (or not addressed) | 2 = Sufficient level of quality |
| 1 = Clear need for improvement | 3 = Yes, or of high quality |

N/A = Not applicable

INTRODUCTION

This checklist is a tool for evaluation focal persons and EVAL officials to appraise the quality of impact evaluation plans and proposals. It can also serve as guidance to the impact evaluation designer and those approving the design. EVAL provides the concerned persons with feedback by returning the completed checklist. The results of the appraisals are not made public and are meant to aid in quality improvement.

1. Definitional compliance
2. Political economy of impact evaluation (IE)
3. Methodological approach
4. Sampling
5. Data collection
6. Analyzing the data
7. Reporting results

THE CHECKLIST

1	IE: Definitional compliance	Score
1.1	Clear statement of evaluation purpose and rationale within national context	
1.2	Key aim is to <i>attribute</i> changes from a particular policy, programme or intervention to individuals, households, communities or organizations	
1.3	Methodological approach will determine the form and level of attribution	
1.4	Means of establishing a comparison group or counterfactual are identified	
1.5	Risks are identified and addressed	
Comments:		

Checklist 9

2	Political economy of IE	Score
2.1	Parameters of study agreed by major partners and stakeholders	
2.2	Clear intended use of results by policy and decision makers	
2.3	Will provide valuable feedback to ILO on programmatic approaches	
2.4	Will determine impact of specific innovation within a broader context; linked to cost-effectiveness	
2.5	Budget considered by key stakeholders to be justified (benefits outweigh costs)	
2.6	Steering committee set up to govern the process	
2.7	Proposed timing aligns with decision making process	
Comments:		
3	Methodological approach	Score
3.1	Has a key question been identified that will be addressed through the study?	
3.2	Is the key question articulated in a theory of change that also identifies the main assumptions being made?	
3.3	Does the proposal explain well how the methodological approach will answer the key question?	
3.4	Does the methodological design adequately address the characteristics of the programme, policy or intervention?	
3.5	Does the design address ethical considerations?	
3.6	Does the design identify how data will be sourced for the study?	
3.7	Does the design plan involve the caliber of expertise for developing the methodology and conducting the analysis? Is a national research partner identified?	
3.8	Does the design mix qualitative and quantitative research methods at key stages of the process to add insight?	
Comments:		
4	Sampling	Score
4.1	Are the data needs and planned means of collecting data explained and costed?	
4.2	Has the sampling frame been narrowly defined and sample size calculated for control and participant groups? Is the sampling unit appropriate?	
4.3	Will clustering be used, and if so, will efforts be taken to minimize spillover, leakage, other potential biases?	
4.4	For experimental designs, will eligible persons be randomly sampled to pre-determine participation and non-participation?	
4.5	For quasi-experimental designs, are the data collection instruments to be aligned for comparison of before/after and target/non-target samples?	
Comments:		

Checklist 9

5	Data collection	Score
5.1	Has a well-qualified national contractor been secured for the field data collection? Are costs in line with national rates for similar work?	
5.2	Will an MIS be set up for data management?	
5.3	Are other data needs (administrative, existing data sets, etc.) identified and planned for?	
5.4	Is baseline data to be collected in advance of roll out of intervention?	
5.5	Are appropriate data being collected to estimate change in the desired outcomes (income, expenditure, assets, attitudes, capacities, etc.). Are means of measurement considered credible in research circles?	
5.6	Are questionnaires to be adapted to local contexts (terminology, units of measurement, language, etc.)?	
5.7	Will enumerators be trained and data collection methods pre-tested?	
Comments:		
6	Analyzing data	Score
6.1	Will an expert in data analysis be secured to carry out the analysis?	
6.2	Will the analysis involve descriptive statistics of quantitative and qualitative information?	
6.3	Will the analysis provide statistically appropriate measurement of the data to infer effects and causality?	
6.4	Will the analysis make use of national research expertise?	
Comments:		
7	Reporting results	Score
7.1	Is there a plan for presenting the results in technical and non-technical reports?	
7.2	Will the technical report be peer reviewed?	
7.3	Will the results be communicated through special events, media, etc.?	
7.4	Will the timing of the report's completion dovetail with policy makers' needs?	
Comments:		