## Guide for Terms of Reference A checklist

The following checklist provides a basis for reviewing the quality of the ToR. It may be used to ensure that all necessary elements are contained within the ToR document.

1.	Introduction and Description of the Intervention
	Are the purposes, the main objectives and the expected effects of the program clearly described?
	Is the rationale for the evaluation (e.g. why the intervention was chosen for evaluation) made explicit?
	Are the target population and the structure of the program intervention (e.g. time period, implemented phases) explained?
	Is the introduction brief (e.g. max two pages), precise and concise?
1.1	Selection Process of Participants
	Are the eligibility criteria indicated?
	In the case selection bias is in place, are the criteria for selection of participants among the applicants well specified?
	Is there a clear description of the external economic and social context within which the program intervention is situated? Are there other factors in addition to participation that are likely to affect the observed outcome?
2.	Specific Scopes and Objectives
	Is there a clear description of the underlying "theory of change" which conceptually links the intervention to the expected changes in the outcomes of interest?
	Is the logical connection between the rationale for the evaluation, the theory of change, the declared intervention objectives, the evaluation purpose and the evaluation questions made explicit?
	Do the evaluation questions address the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the program being evaluated?
3.	Data Availability
	Does the ToR clearly indicates the data sources (administrative and/or survey) provided for the evaluation?
	Are the available data sources ready to work? Do they need data cleaning and data quality pre-processing phases? How long does it take for the contractor to get access to the data? Are these issues clearly described in the ToR?

	If administrative data are available, is confidentiality of data explicitly required? Are there any ethical and professional standard to be considered? Is it explicitly indicated in the ToR?
4.	Methodological Approach
	Does the ToR clearly indicate a range of counterfactual methodologies (e.g. family of methods) for the evaluation plan that is consistent with the evaluation questions and the available data?
	Does the ToR leave to the evaluators the possibility to improve the proposed methodologies?
5.	Selection and Award Criteria
	Are the requirements on the evaluation team (e.g. size, experience, composition) clearly indicated?
	Does the ToR provide enough details on the principal investigator qualifications, on the necessary technical resources and the distribution of the responsibilities among the team members?
	Is there a requirement on the quality control arrangements (e.g. detailed timetable, planned tasks and subtasks, potential risks and challenges) throughout the evaluation process to be satisfied by the evaluators?
	Are the selection criteria described with clarity and objectivity in the ToR?
	Do the exposed criteria really differentiate between bids without posing too much weight on the offered price? Are the quality of the proposal and the experience and expertise of the researchers taken into account criteria for their actual value by the proposed?
	Does the ToR require CIE experts to be included in the selection panel to guarantee enough weights to the quality criteria?
6.	List of Deliverables and Time Schedule
	Does the ToR clearly describe the requested deliverables (e.g. inception, intermediate and final reports) and the corresponding timeline for the study?
	Are the required quality checks throughout the evaluation process made explicit?