



## CDC Eswatini ESOP Checklist Template - Partner

<b>Name of Partner</b>	ICAP, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University
<b>Name of Project</b>	Strengthening Local Capacity to Deliver Sustainable Quality-Assured Universal Clinical HIV/TB Services.
<b>COAG Number</b>	U2GH001433
<b>Title of Evaluation</b>	Evaluation: Strengthening local capacity to deliver sustainable quality assured universal coverage of clinical TB/HIV services in Manzini region, and provide central level technical assistance to the national Tuberculosis control program (NTCP) in the Kingdom of Eswatini under the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR)
<b>Project End Date</b>	30 September, 2020
<b>Evaluation Start Date</b>	08 July, 2019
<b>Date Evaluation Report approved by CDC</b>	13 August, 2020
<b>Reviewer Name</b>	Sam Kudhlande
<b>Reviewer Title</b>	Public Health Specialist - Strategic Information
<b>Date of Review</b>	13 August, 2020



## EVALUATION ADHERENCE TO PEPFAR EVALUATION STANDARDS OF PRACTICE (ESoP)

**ESoP Adherence Rating:** In responding to the question “Was the standard met?”, please use the following definitions:

**NO:** None of the required ESoP components listed in the respective row were met;

**PARTIALLY:** One or more of the required ESoP components listed in the respective row were met, but not all;

**YES:** Every ESoP component listed in the respective row was met.

For each “NO” or “PARTIALLY” met rating, a justification must be provided in the comments/recommendations section; recommendations are to be provided where necessary and appropriate.

ESoP 1: Engage Stakeholders	Was the standard met?			Comments/Recommendations
1a. The evaluation team identified the stakeholders, their information needs, and involved these stakeholders in informing the design, implementing the evaluation, disseminating, and using the results.	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ESoP 2: Clearly State Evaluation Questions, Purpose, and Objectives	Was the standard met?			Comments/Recommendations
2a. There is a clear description of the project being evaluated, the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation questions, and how the evaluation results will be used and by whom.	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ESoP 3: Use Appropriate Evaluation Designs, Methods, and Analysis	Was the standard met?			Comments/Recommendations
3a. The selected design, methods, and analytical plan are appropriate for the evaluation questions being asked. (Please reference your agency’s protocol processes – as well as the data collection tools referred to in 3b)	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3b. The data collection tools (questionnaires, checklists, interview guides, and other instruments) used in the evaluation are provided in the annex of the report or protocol.	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ESoP 4: Address Ethical Considerations and Assurances	Was the standard met?			Comments/Recommendations
4a. The evaluation report describes procedures in place to ensure human rights were protected with respect to privacy, confidentiality, and maintenance of the dignity of participants and applied for IRB approval where applicable or other human-subject review (for non-research evaluation).	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4b. If interviews are were conducted, informed consent procedures were described and documented in the protocol to ensure that participants were informed of the risks and benefits of their participation, as well as the lack of	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



consequences in their eligibility to receive services regardless of their participation.				
<b>ESoP 5: Identify Resources and Articulate Budget</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
5a. The evaluation report included total cost of implementing the evaluation.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Section 3.0
<b>ESoP 6: Construct Data Collection and Management Plans</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
6a. Data collection and management procedures were described in the evaluation report. Changes made to the evaluation plan/protocol were documented.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ESoP 7: Ensure Appropriate Evaluator Qualifications and Evaluation Independence</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
7a. The evaluation report includes a description of the evaluation team including: evaluator names, each member's role in the evaluation, and their background and experiences, providing evidence of the teams' qualifications in the technical areas of the project and in research/evaluation methods.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7b. The evaluation report provides evidence of the management of conflict of interest for both internal and external evaluations, including statements of conflict of interest procedures and declarations to ensure credibility and mitigate bias.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ESoP 8: Monitor the Planning and Implementation of an Evaluation</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
8a. There is evidence of adequate planning and monitoring of the evaluation implementation such as work plans, timelines/schedules, and deliverables by the team lead and USG staff providing oversight.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ESoP 9: Produce Quality Evaluation Reports</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
9a. The evaluation report has all relevant components of a high quality evaluation report including: · cover and title pages; · executive summary; · project background · evaluation purpose and questions; · evaluation design, methods, and limitations; · findings and conclusions	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· recommendations;</li> <li>· dissemination</li> <li>· references</li> <li>· appendices (evaluation protocol/SOW, data collection tools, informed consent forms, abridged bios of evaluation team members, Conflict of Interest Statements, evaluation costs, data sources, results frameworks/logical frameworks, funding documents)</li> </ul>				
9b. The evaluation report conveys that the evaluation was undertaken in a manner to ensure credibility, objectivity, transparency, and the generation of high quality information and knowledge?	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The grant action mandated internal evaluation but appropriate steps (e.g. lead evaluator from ICAP HQ) were taken to ensure objectivity and credibility
9c. Findings are specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative and/or qualitative evidence from multiple sources, data collection methods, and analytic techniques. If not, an explanation is provided.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
9d. Each conclusion in the report is supported by a specific or clearly defined finding.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
9e. Each recommendation is supported by a specific or clearly defined set of findings and conclusions, and are feasible, specific, responsive to the purpose, and action-oriented.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ESoP 10: Disseminate Results</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>
10a. The evaluation report includes a dissemination plan for how the findings of the evaluation will be disseminated to relevant stakeholders (e.g. reports, presentations, publications, agency websites, annual reports, policy briefs).	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Report shared with stakeholders, feedback incorporated, final report shared electronically due to COVID-19 restrictions.
10b. The final evaluation report was uploaded to the respective agency website within 90 days after clearance/approvals by all relevant authorities.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Report uploaded to ICAP websites <a href="https://icap.columbia.edu/where-we-work/eswatini/">https://icap.columbia.edu/where-we-work/eswatini/</a>
<b>ESoP 11: Use Findings for Program Improvement</b>	<b>Was the standard met?</b>			<b>Comments/Recommendations</b>



11a. The evaluation report includes a stated plan for how the evaluation findings will be used for decision-making and program improvement (e.g. mid-course corrections, new procurements, resource allocation, and intervention uptake) and timeframe, if appropriate.	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>PARTIALLY</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	---------------------------------------	--	---	--