



Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report

A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 201

Partial Revision Date: 11/02/2022
Responsible Office: PPL
File Name: 201maa_110222

Pursuant to [ADS 201.3.6.9](#), draft evaluation reports must undergo a peer review organized by the office managing the evaluation. One purpose for the review is to ensure USAID commissioned evaluations meet the Principles and Standards of Evaluation in [ADS 201.3.6.2](#).

The following criteria should serve as the basis for reviewing the report. To help ensure a high-quality evaluation report, those who commission an evaluation must include the following criteria in the evaluation statement of work (SOW) to communicate USAID's quality criteria to evaluators.

- 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 adhere to plain language guidelines per the [USAID Style Guide](#).
- Evaluation reports should adequately address all evaluation questions included in the SOW, or the evaluation questions subsequently revised and documented in consultation and agreement with USAID.
- 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 should be properly identified. Sufficient information on methodology and data collection should be included to allow stakeholders to make informed judgments about the quality and accuracy of the findings, and to allow other evaluators to replicate the protocol.
- 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 people of different genders. If evaluation findings or data include people-level indicators, they must be disaggregated by sex.
- 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 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. **Evaluations should be oriented to reinforcing local ownership; when possible, evaluators should include relevant local stakeholders in joint development of recommendations.**

201maa_110222