



Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS)

Technical Note Evaluation Committee

What is an Evaluation committee?
Who chairs and sits in the Evaluation Committee?
When to set up the Evaluation Committee?
Sample draft Terms of Reference for Evaluation Committee

1. What is an Evaluation committee?

- 1. The Evaluation Committee (EC) is a temporary group responsible for overseeing the evaluation process, making key decisions and reviewing evaluation products submitted to the Chair for approval. It helps ensuring due process in evaluation management and maintaining distance from programme implementers (preventing potential risks of undue influence), while also supporting and giving advice to the Evaluation Manager. Key decisions expected to be made by the EC relate to the evaluation purpose, scope, timeline, budget and team selection as well as approving the final TORs, inception report and evaluation report. The establishment of an EC for each decentralized evaluation is part of the impartiality provisions foreseen by WFP Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Charter (ED circular OED2016/007). See also the Technical Note on Independence and impartiality for more details.
- 2. The EC is complemented by an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) a larger group of internal and external stakeholders with an advisory role (see <u>TN Evaluation Reference Group</u>).

2. Who chairs and sits in the Evaluation Committee?

3. The EC is established and chaired by the Country Director (CD) or the Deputy Country Director (DCD). The chair role may be delegated to the DCD, except when the DCD is also the Head of Programme. The number of EC members can range between 4 and 7 as follows:

The CD or DCD (Chair of the EC)	Mandatory
Evaluation Manager (EC Secretariat)	Mandatory
Head of Programme or Programme officer(s) directly in charge of the subject(s) of evaluation	Mandatory
Regional Evaluation Officer (REO)	Mandatory
Country Office M&E Officer (if different from the Evaluation Manager)	Optional

¹ The EC for DEs commissioned by a regional bureau should be chaired by the Regional Director or Deputy Regional Director. The EC for DEs commissioned by a Headquarter division/unit should be chaired by the Director of Division or Unit Chief. In both cases, the EC membership should be tailored accordingly.

Country Office Procurement Officer (if the evaluation is contracted to a firm)	Optional
Other staff considered useful for this process	Optional

- 4. The Procurement Officer will need to participate in the EC meeting for any decisions related to the contracting, particularly during the preparation phase.
- 5. In some instances, the Regional Evaluation Officer may not have the capacity to be a member of the Evaluation Committee for all Decentralized Evaluations' commissioned in his/her region in a given year. Hence, s/he may delegate to another member of the Regional Evaluation Team, making sure however, to follow through the evaluation processes, and provide appropriate advice and support should particular challenges arise.
- 6. The membership of the Evaluation Committee will need to be wider for Joint Evaluations and include all stakeholders that are part of the decision-making process. Further information is available in the <u>Technical Note on Joint Evaluations</u>.

3. When to set up the Evaluation Committee?

- 7. The EC should be initiated during the Planning Phase. Members should be informed of their expected contributions to the evaluation as well as of the tentative timelines within which they will be required to accomplish each task (see suggested ToR in box 1, and real-world examples in section 5, *Further Reading*). If the planning phase took place a long time before the foreseen start of the preparation phase, the EC Chair should re-confirm the EC composition and formally set up the EC prior to the start of the preparation phase.
- 8. Most of the EC responsibilities can be accomplished through e-mail communication, although occasional face-to-face group meetings may be necessary at key points in the process.

Learn more about senior management's experience in engaging with the evaluation process.

Purnima Kashyap, Director of REACH, shared insights at the Evaluation Learning Programme in April 2018 on how to engage effectively with WFP Management during an evaluation.

Watch the video to learn more about it: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GcU9lvFNl3l&feature=youtu.be

4. Sample draft Terms of Reference for Evaluation Committee

9. A summary of typical EC responsibilities is provided in the ToR template in Box 1 below.

Box 1: Sample TOR template for the Evaluation Committee

Context: [Brief account of the evaluation to be undertaken, including subject, scope (activities, geographic and period covered) and estimated timelines].

Purpose: The purpose of the EC is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation in accordance with WFP Evaluation Policy 2016-2021. It will achieve this by supporting the evaluation manager in making decisions, reviewing draft deliverables (TOR, inception report and evaluation report) and submitting them for approval by the CD/DCD who will be the chair of the committee.

The composition of the EC [4-6 members, ensuring a mix of relevant expertise]:

- The CD or DCD (Chair of the EC)
- Evaluation Manager (EC Secretariat)
- Head of Programme or Programme officer(s) directly in charge of the subject(s) of evaluation
- Regional Evaluation Officer (REO)

- Country Office M&E Officer (if different from the Evaluation Manager)
- Country Office Procurement Officer (if the evaluation is contracted to a firm)
- Other staff considered useful for this process

Responsibilities of the Evaluation Committee: [Set out the areas of engagement and responsibilities for the EC (as indicated in Table below). Ensure that there is clarity in the difference between the tasks of the EC and the ERG to ensure that the two mechanisms are complementary. For example, the ERG is not involved in the selection of the evaluation team and in the approval of ToR, inception and evaluation report]

Time commitment [Summarise estimated number of days by phase and main tasks and approximate time frame within which inputs by the EC will be required. See table below for examples.]

Tasks by evaluation phase	Estimated time²	Approximate dates³
 Preparation Phase Select and establish ERG membership Reviews the revised draft ToR prepared by the EM on the basis of: The outsourced Quality Support service feedback ERG comments The EM responses documented in the comments matrix Approves the final TOR Approves the final evaluation team and budget 	½ to 1 day	Relevant weeks/months e.g. Feb/Mar 2018
 Inception Phase Briefs the evaluation team on the subject of the evaluation Informs evaluation design Supports identifying field visit sites on the basis of selection criteria, defined by the evaluation team in the IR though the EC should not influence actual selection Reviews the revised draft IR on the basis of: The outsourced Quality Support service and EM feedback ERG comments The Evaluation team responses in the comments matrix Approves the final IR. 	2 days	Relevant weeks/months e.g. June 2018
 Data Collection Phase Act as key informants: responds to interview questions Facilitates access to sources of contextual information and data, and to stakeholders Attends the end of field work debriefing(s) meeting Supports the team in clarifying emerging issues and identifying how to fill any data gaps 	2 days	Relevant weeks/months e.g. Sep/Oct 2018
 Data Analysis and Reporting Phase Review the revised draft ER on the basis of: The outsourced Quality Support service and EM feedback ERG comments The Evaluation team responses in the comments matrix Approves the final ER 	2 days	Relevant weeks/ months e.g. Nov/Dec 2018
Dissemination and Follow-up Phase Leads the preparation to the management response to the evaluation Decides whether management agrees, partially agrees or does not agree with the recommendations	1 day minimum	Post completion of report e.g. Jan/Apr 2018

² The time the EM spends on these tasks will be considerably more; these ToRs will not apply to the EM.

³ Approximate dates are meant to give a tentative indication of when engagement is required. These can be revised once the evaluation teams in on-board.

•	Clears the management response		
•	Disseminates the Management Response to key stakeholders		

Procedures of Engagement

- The country director will appoint members of the EC [as soon as a decision to evaluate is made].
- The EM will notify the members of the date, time, location and agenda of meetings at least [indicate most appropriate notice time] before the meeting and share any background materials for preparation.
- EC meetings will be held face-to face and/or via electronic conference call/Skype and/or email depending on the need, the agenda and the content.

5. Further reading

- Research Into Use, (2010). Impact evaluation steering committee: Terms of reference. Retrieved from website: https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/riu1007impactsteering-tor.pdf
- Outline terms of reference for evaluation steering committees. (2012). In *Guideline for Evaluation Steering Committees*.
 Department for Performance Monitoring and Evaluation, Government of New Zealand. Accessed at:
 https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/images/gallery/Terms%20of%20Reference%20for%20Evaluation%20Steering%20Committees.pdf
- Terms of Reference for the Independent Steering Committee for the Evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education. (2013). Global Partnership for Education. Accessed online at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/terms-reference-independent-steering-committee-evaluation-global-partnership-education

For more information on Decentralised Evaluations visit our webpage