A beneficiary feedback approach to evaluation: Checklist for evaluation commissioners

(Extract from "[Beneficiary Feedback in Evaluation]()," *a Department for International Development Working Paper written by Leslie Groves, Independent Consultant)*

Evaluation Stage	Considerations
Preparing for an evaluation: Developing the Terms of Reference	Is there **a sufficiently strong commitmen**t to beneficiary feedback in evaluation amongst the commissioning team? Have relevant stakeholders bought into this approach? If not, can you support them to do so? Is adaptive programming a feature of the programme? Does the **context section** clarify who the beneficiaries are, programme relationship with beneficiaries, whether there has already been a process of beneficiary feedback during programme implementation and if so, what this was?. Are there **other evaluations** that you can link with/ build on to minimise beneficiary burden? Or programme level monitoring data or processes that could be used or built on? Does the **methodology section** require due consideration of different types of beneficiary feedback in each of the four stages of the evaluation process? Does the **target audience** section include beneficiaries,? Should it? Do the **competencies** required support meaningful and ethical beneficiary feedback? Would it be reasonable to include representatives of the beneficiary population (e.g. town mayor or other leaders) on the **advisory group/ evaluation reference group**? Have you required a **dissemination and communication plan** that includes beneficiaries/ beneficiary evaluation participants? Do the **outputs include appropriate** products for feeding back to beneficiaries living in poverty e.g. a youth friendly summary? Radio show? Poster? Will the **evaluation questions** include how well project staff listened and responded to feedback? Is there any **scope for beneficiary input** into the Terms of Reference?
Design	Do processes **of quality assurance** of inception reports and methodological papers: a) Assess whether beneficiary feedback has been considered in each of the four stages of evaluation design b) Verify that methodological choices enable meaningful beneficiary feedback in a way that adds value to the evaluation process and c) Validate choices made where there is a decision not to engage in beneficiary feedback in evaluation design, validation and provisional analysis, and dissemination and communication?
Evidence gathering, analysis and validation	Do processes of **quality assurance** of draft and final reports: – monitor the quality of beneficiary feedback- both methodologically and ethically and – ensure that commitments made in design are followed through and that beneficiary feedback is not the first thing to "drop off" the list as often happens?
Dissemination and communication	Are **necessary resources invested** in ensuring that dissemination and communication, including of management responses, occurs in a meaningful manner- including to beneficiaries and to decision makers within and outside of the organisation? Is there scope for supporting a commitment to ensuring that **dissemination goes all the way down the chain**, including beneficiary representatives who might have responsibility for feeding findings back to their communities? Are implementing or other partners prepared to support dissemination activities? If so, is it possible to agree a joint strategy?