



## Checklist for evaluators

### **Developing and Assessing a Proposal for an Evaluation Mandate**

Awarding an evaluation mandate is a competitive process. The Evaluation and Research Service uses a checklist “Assessment of an Evaluation Proposal” for judging the submissions, first, individually and then by making a cross comparison of the results. The main criteria (judgment criteria) are: appropriateness, price, deadlines, criteria about the evaluators, and the general impression which emerges.

The proposal must meet the following criteria first and foremost:

- The mandate has been correctly understood and the proposed procedure is clear
- Data collection is adequate for responding to the evaluation questions
- Data treatment and analysis are adequate
- Evaluation products are adequately described
- Overall, the cost-benefit ratio is appropriate
- The time plan is realistic
- The evaluation team satisfactorily meets the conditions needed to carry out the mandate
- The overall impression is convincing

The checklist “Assessment of an Evaluation Proposal” is based on the above eight criteria; sub-criteria are also included, but are not exhaustive nor deliberately weighted and rated individually.

#### **Everything is important! What deserves particular attention?**

In this checklist, the Evaluation and Research Service proposes several items which it believes merit particular consideration.

##### **1. Size and completeness of the proposal**

In principle, the size of the proposal should be commensurate with the significance of the mandate! But as a general rule, it should not exceed eight to ten pages A4 (excluding title page, table of contents and annexes). It must be complete and include the required signatures.

##### **2. Bidders’ proposals within the framework / in addition to the mandate**

The specifications set out in the terms of reference are generally more or less directive (“focused on performance” / “solution seeking”). However, bidders are encouraged to propose their own ideas, additions, variations etc. These must be realistic and present an added value.

##### **3. Logic models**

Illustrations showing the logic (of the flow or effects) of the programme, packet of measure or project is a structuring element: it serves as the basis of communication. Programme logic models are therefore most welcome, especially when used to emphasise the focus of an evaluation.

#### 4. Multi-method approaches

Basically, bidders must plan on using adequate **multi-method** (combining quantitative and qualitative methods) **approaches**.

Wherever possible, the proposal should describe the proposed tools and corresponding criteria, for example, for verifying if the programmes, projects or measures are a “success”.

Just how this information might be presented is illustrated in the following tables. The example given is taken from the “Strategic objective: elimination of measles by 2015”.

Main Evaluation Questions	Target Group(s) for data collection	Methods data collection, treatment and/or analysis	Sample (size N/n = ?; justification of sample selection)	Available Data (available data sources?)
<b>Effectiveness:</b> By the end of 2015, will 95% of children up to 2 years have received two doses of the measles vaccine?	Population (parents)	<b>Secondary Analysis</b> Swiss National Vaccine Coverage Survey by canton (SNVCS): Comparative analysis per canton, per 3-year cycle, from 1999 to 2016	n = 8000 per cycle	SNVCS data available
		<b>New data collection:</b> population survey in 2016 (parents)	n <sub>2016</sub> = 860 (planned)	
		<b>Comparison target situation vs actual situation – and before-after comparison:</b> national population survey (2012/2016)	n <sub>2012</sub> = 860	National population survey: baseline (2012) – data available
<b>Effectiveness:</b> Which measures are cantons using to assure long term vaccination of under 2-year olds?	Cantons (Health Directors)	<b>Documentary research and analysis</b>		
		<b>Semi-directive interviews</b>	Cantons: n = 3	
		<b>Written questionnaire survey</b>	Cantons: N = 26	

Unit of Comparison / Criteria of Assessment	Comparative Analysis (comparison target situation vs actual situation – before-after; longitudinal and cross comparisons)
Vaccine coverage rate	Cross comparison, longitudinal comparison: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vaccine coverage ratio by canton and by 3-year cycle (SNVCS)</li> </ul> <hr/> Comparison target situation – actual situation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>target: 95% of children under 2 years with two doses</li> <li>actual: actual vaccine coverage with two doses</li> </ul> <hr/> Comparison before-after: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vaccine coverage rate 2012</li> <li>vaccine coverage rate 2016</li> </ul>

# Checklist "Assessment of an Evaluation Proposal"

- References:
- Bundesgesetz über das öffentliche Beschaffungswesen (SR 172.056.1)
  - Verordnung über das öffentliche Beschaffungswesen (SR 172.056.11)
  - Checklist "Developing a Proposal for an Evaluation Mandate"; FOPH, Evaluation and Research Service
  - Terms of reference for this evaluation (= evaluation mandate)

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

Proposal Title:	
Bidders:	
Assessment by:	
Date:	

## 0 Exclusion Criteria

Tick the relevant box

<b>Delay:</b> The proposal arrived after the deadline.	
<b>Dependence / bias:</b> The bidders have conflicting interests which would affect (bias) the mandate.	

a) Before assessing the proposals, the weighting of the judgment criteria should be determined. b) To assess the proposals, use the points scale below for scoring the criteria. * <b>Assessment Points Scale (maximum 2 digits after the decimal point):</b> 1 = unusable; requirements not fulfilled 2 = bad; requirements largely unfulfilled 3 = insufficient; requirements only partially fulfilled 4 = sufficient; merely respected requirements 5 = good; all the requirements fulfilled 6 = very good; all the requirements fulfilled to high standard	Assessment *	Weighting of Judgment Criteria	Average Points (AP)	AP Weighting
<b>1 Adequacy of the Proposed Activities</b>				
<b>The mandate has been correctly understood and the proposed procedure is clear.</b>		25%		
The initial/problematic situation is clearly understood.				
The evaluand is adequately described; ideally the description is based on an "logic model".				
The mandate is correctly understood.				
The phased work plan and corresponding time allocations are set out in a way that is clearly comprehensible.				
<b>Data collection is adequate for responding to the evaluation questions.</b>				
The selected evaluation approach, data collection methods and use of data are adequate.				
The selected sample(s) and sampling size(s) are appropriate.				
Data sources and data availability (accessibility) are indicated.				
<b>Data treatment and analysis are adequate.</b>				
Proposed methods for data treatment are adequate.				
Specification of the evaluation criteria and their application (and how they are made measurable) are appropriate.				
Data analysis procedures are clearly described.				
<b>Evaluation products are adequately described.</b>				
In the proposal, the required evaluation products are adequately detailed and proposed in an appropriate format.				
The detailed discussion of the scientific investigation's relevance and limitations is adequate.				
<b>2 Price (cost)</b>				
<b>Overall, the cost-benefit ratio is appropriate.</b>		30%		
Price setting is transparent.				
The total cost is realistic / respects the project's maximum budget allowance.				
The average daily fee (total cost divided by the number of planned work days) is acceptable.				
<b>3 Time Plan</b>				
<b>The time plan is realistic.</b>		15%		
Possible risks for conducting the evaluation and their potential impact on the timetable have been taken into account.				
<b>4 Criteria relative to the Bidders</b>				
<b>The evaluation team satisfactorily meets the conditions needed to carry out the mandate.</b>		20%		
The evaluation team has sufficient, available staff resources to fulfill the mandate.				
The project organisation (tasks / competences / responsibilities) is clearly set out.				
The evaluation team has acquired professional experience through working on other evaluation projects.				
The evaluation team has the necessary language skills, particularly in German and French.				
Team members' independence and impartiality are declared (no conflict of interests).				
<b>5 Overall Impression</b>				
<b>The overall impression is convincing.</b>		10%		
In general, the proposal is consistent with the terms of reference.				
The flexibility permitted in the request for proposals (e.g. originality, creativity, innovativeness) has been taken up.				
The proposal is clearly written and error free.				
		<b>100%</b>	Total	<b>0.00</b>

# Comments / Notes

Proposal Title:

Bidders:

Exclusion Justification	

Principal Criteria	Aspects / Facts	Assessment	
		strength (+)	weakness (-)
Adequacy			
Price (cost)	Total costs (TVA included) amounts to ..... CHF		
Time Plan			
Criteria relative to the Bidders			
Overall Impression			