

Feedback Form for Evaluation Plan

Program Name:	
Review completed by: (Name and Title)	Date:

This form is intended to be a tool for external reviewers to use for providing systematic feedback on evaluation plans. It is also meant to provide useful guidance to evaluation plan authors themselves as they develop or revise their own evaluation plans.

This document has two parts. Part I is for an overall assessment, Part II contains more detailed section-by-section comments.

Suggested process:

1. Read through entire evaluation plan being reviewed
2. Provide general overarching comments in Part I
3. Complete Part II as directed
4. Revisit and revise your comments in Part I

Part I: Overall Assessment:

Evaluation plans should:

- Provide an accurate, concise and coherent description of the program
- Explain what evaluation work is being planned and how the work will be accomplished
- Be internally consistent (the planned evaluation should be appropriate for the program's content, lifecycle stage, and stakeholder needs; and the elements of the evaluation plan should be consistent with each other (evaluation purpose, scope, questions, measures, sampling strategy, design and analysis plans).)

With these things in mind, please give some overall comments on the plan, an explanation of your assessment, and any further suggestions

Part II: Section by Section Assessment

The categories below correspond to Evaluation Plan Sections. The short description in each section is intended to guide reviewers and ensure consistent feedback. Please add helpful comments.

Program Mission Statement

The Mission statement should be concise and clear, specific to the program and not to the larger organization, and should convey the “big picture” motivation for the program.

Program Description

The Program Description should be clear, concise, and should have enough information to give outsiders a good understanding of the program. Ideally it would include information about participants (number, age, background if relevant); main program activities and overall goals; basic information about how program is implemented (setting, frequency, who leads it, and so on as appropriate); and about the history or community context of the program.

Evaluation Purpose Statement

The Evaluation Purpose Statement serves almost as an “Executive Summary” for the Evaluation Plan. It should describe briefly what the upcoming round (usually a year) of evaluation work will include. It should identify the specific program elements that are the evaluation’s focus, and should articulate the main goals of the evaluation and how the results will be used. Reviewers please comment on whether the evaluation goals seem appropriate relative to the program lifecycle and any other specifics of the program (such as stakeholder needs) that are known from the program description.

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Questions form the basis for the entire evaluation plan, so this section is critical. The questions should be clear, specific, and should be formatted properly. They should be appropriate for the program's lifecycle, and should be consistent with the evaluation purpose statement. Questions should be clearly related to the program's logic and/or pathway model. If the question involves a comparison, the intended basis for comparison should be made clear (pre vs post, compared to another group, etc.). Reviewers should attempt to assess feasibility – is the number and difficulty level of the questions likely to be manageable? (Subsequent sections may make this more apparent). Ideally, Evaluation Questions should be numbered so that subsequent sections can refer to them consistently and without confusing readers.

Evaluation Sample

This section should concisely describe the sample that will be used to answer each evaluation question. It should provide enough information to assess whether the selected sample will serve as a sound basis for the claims the evaluation is intended to address. Accordingly, the "population of interest" should be made clear, sample size and composition should be described, and the recruitment or sample selection process should be described. Reviewers should comment on whether the sample(s) appear to be sufficient for generating evidence on the desired claims.

Evaluation Measures

There should be a measure for each evaluation question, and it should be easy for readers to tell which measure covers which question. Measure description should include its type (i.e., written survey, observational checklist, structured interview, etc.) along with other relevant details (length, who will administer it, etc.), and should clearly indicate the focal construct (what will the obtained information be about?) It should be clear whether each measure is already in hand, needs to be adapted (if so, how), or needs to be located or developed. For existing measures, proper references should be cited. If reliability and validity information are available that should be included. Reviewers should comment on whether the measure will be appropriate for generating evidence on the evaluation question, and whether it appears to fit the program and stakeholder needs.

Evaluation Design

The Design section should lay out the sequence of observations (when measures are implemented) and activities (the whole program, or specific components) clearly and concisely and should indicate the design type (e.g. post-only, pre/post, pre/post with comparison group, etc.) For simple designs, the description will be very brief. All measure should be included. If using comparison groups, the timing of when observations will be gathered from them should be indicated clearly. If symbolic notation is used it should provide clarity, and all symbols should be defined. Reviewers should comment on whether the design is appropriate for the program's lifecycle, and whether the design is appropriate and sufficient for generating evidence for the evaluation question.

Data Management

The evaluation plan should include a description of how each measure will be administered; how the data will be collected, handled, and stored; and (if applicable) how the data will be coded or scored. (All of this is in preparation for the actual analysis.) This information may be included in or distributed across the measures and analysis sections of the plan. Reviewers please comment here on the completeness, clarity, and quality of this aspect of the plan.

Analysis

The analysis section should clearly and concisely describe how all the data generated from all the measures and sample groups will be analyzed in order to obtain high-quality, credible answers to each of the evaluation questions. Reviewers should comment on whether the analysis strategy is appropriate and sufficient for generating evidence to answer the related evaluation question(s).

Evaluation Reporting

The reporting section should describe how all the results of the evaluation will be shared, for both internal and external purposes. Formal and informal reporting should be included, and the format, timing, and frequency should be indicated. It can be helpful to organize this section by evaluation question but this is not the only option. However it is organized, the section should be clear and concise and should cover all the evaluation questions. The reporting plan should fit and fulfill the purpose and scope of the current evaluation.

Evaluation Timeline

The timeline should be given in calendar time (not just in relative terms) so that it serves as an effective work-planning calendar. It should include program and/or activity dates (whichever is relevant). For each evaluation question the timeline should cover the detailed steps of the evaluation work, indicating start and end dates for sample identification and recruitment; measure development and testing (if needed); data collection; data entry; data analysis; reporting. Ideally, the timeline will include time for measure revision and evaluation plan updating. The timeline is a good opportunity for assessing feasibility of the plan. Reviewer should offer comments on manageability of this work plan, if possible.

Overall Presentation Quality

Reviewer, please provide feedback on grammar, spelling and overall readability and general appearance of the evaluation plan.