Data Quality Assessment Checklist and Recommended Procedures

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is provided as a recommended tool that an operating unit (OU) may use to complete its DQAs. If the OU prefers or has successfully used a different tool for conducting and documenting its DQAs in the past, they are free to continue the use of that tool instead. The checklist below is intended to assist in assessing each of the five aspects of data quality and provide a convenient manner in which to document the OU's DQA findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name:

Title of Performance Indicator:

[Indicator should be copied directly from the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet]

Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):

Result This Indicator Measures [For USAID only] (i.e., Specify the Development Objective, Intermediate Result, or Project Purpose, etc.):

Data Source(s):

[Information can be copied directly from the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet]

Partner or Contractor Who Provided the Data:

[It is recommended that this checklist is completed for each partner that contributes data to an indicator— it should state in the contract or grant that it is the prime's responsibility to ensure the data quality of sub-contractors or sub grantees.]

Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:

Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator
	Custom (created by the OU; not standard)

Data Quality Assessment methodology:

[Describe here or attach to this checklist the methods and procedures for assessing the quality of the indicator data. E.g. Reviewing data collection procedures and documentation, interviewing those responsible for data analysis, checking a sample of the data for errors, etc.]

Date(s) of Assessment:

Assessment Team Members:

USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA

Team Leader Officer approval

Χ_

		YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALI	DITY – Data should clearly and adequately repres	ent th	ie inte	ended result.
1	Does the information collected measure what it			
-	is supposed to measure? (E.g. A valid measure			
	of overall nutrition is healthy variation in diet;			
	Age is not a valid measure of overall health.)			
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible			
2	range?			
3	Is there reasonable assurance that the data			
5	collection methods being used do not produce			
	systematically biased data (e.g. consistently			
	over- or under-counting)?			
4	Are sound research methods being used to			
-	collect the data?			
RELI	ABILITY – Data should reflect stable and consister	t data	a colle	ection processes and analysis
	nods over time.			
1	When the same data collection method is used			
	to measure/observe the same thing multiple			
	times, is the same result produced each time?			
	(E.g. A ruler used over and over always			
	indicates the same length for an inch.)			
2	Are data collection and analysis methods			
	documented in writing and being used to			
	ensure the same procedures are followed each			
	time?			
	ELINESS – Data should be available at a useful free	-	y, sho	uld be current, and should be
time	ly enough to influence management decision mal	king.	1	
1	Are data available frequently enough to inform			
	program management decisions?			
2	Are the data reported the most current			
	practically available?			
3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after			
	collection?			
	CISION – Data have a sufficient level of detail to p	ermit	mana	gement decision making; e.g. the
	gin of error is less than the anticipated change.	[1	
1	Is the margin of error less than the expected			
	change being measured? (E.g. If a change of			
	only 2% is expected and the margin of error in a			
	survey used to collect the data is +/- 5%, then			
	the tool is not precise enough to detect the			
	change.)			
2	Has the margin of error been reported along			
	with the data? (Only applicable to results			

	obtained through statistical samples.)				
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used				
	to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough				
	to register the expected change? (E.g. A				
	yardstick may not be a precise enough tool to				
	measure a change of a few millimeters.)				
INTE	INTEGRITY – Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or				
data	a manipulation.				
1	Are procedures or safeguards in place to				
	minimize data transcription errors?				
3	Is there independence in key data collection,				
	management, and assessment procedures?				
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent				
	unauthorized changes to the data?				

SUMMARY

Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?

Significance of limitations (if any):

Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):

IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this	
indicator, why not?	
What concrete actions are now being taken to collect	
and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

Recommendations for Conducting Data Quality Assessments

- 1. Data Quality (DQ) assessor should make sure that they understand the precise definition of the indicator by checking the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet. Please address any issues of ambiguity before the DQA is conducted.
- 2. DQ assessor should have a copy of the methodology for data collection in hand before assessing the indicator. For USAID Missions, this information should be in the PMP's Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for each indicator. Each indicator should have a written description of how the data being assessed are supposed to be collected.
- 3. Each implementing partner should have a copy of the method of data collection in their files and documented evidence that they are collecting the data according to the methodology.
- 4. DQ assessor should record the names and titles of all individuals involved in the assessment.
- 5. Does the implementing partner have documented evidence that they have verified the data that has been reported? Partners should be able to provided USAID with documents (process/person conducting the verification/field visit dates/persons met/activities visited, etc) which demonstrates that they have verified the data that was reported. Note: Verification by the partners should be an ongoing process.
- 6. The DQ assessor should be able to review the implementing partner files/records against the methodology for data collection laid out in the PMP (for USAID Missions only). Any data quality concerns should be documented.
- 7. The DQ should include a summary of significant limitations found. A plan of action, including timelines and responsibilities, for addressing the limitations should be made.