

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2016.4

Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow

		Notes for QA
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	Evaluation of Humanitarian Action: Child Survival in North Darfur	
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2016/001	
<b>Region</b>	MENA	
<b>Year of Report</b>	2016	
<b>Office</b>	Sudan	
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Sudan	
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes	
<b>Date of Review</b>	19/03/2017	
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	ImpactReady (incl. Merits)	
<b>Classification of Evaluation Report</b>		
<b>Management of Evaluation</b> ( <i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i> )		<b>UNICEF managed</b>
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>WASH</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Nutrition</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Education</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Child protection</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Social inclusion</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Gender equality (cross-cutting)</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Evaluation object</b>		<b>Programme</b>
<b>Evaluation type</b>		<b>Summative</b>
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>		<b>Mixed methods</b>
<b>Evaluation design</b>		<b>Participatory</b>
<b>Evaluation level</b>		<b>Impact</b>
<b>Geographic Scope</b>		<b>National</b>
<b>SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	<b>Yes</b>

	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Yes
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	Yes
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Yes
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Yes
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Yes
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	100%
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Yes
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Yes
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	67%
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Mostly
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Mostly
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b>	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory
<p><b>The object of evaluation is described in detail and its main components are clearly explained. Similarly, intended beneficiaries and the context of the intervention, including a situation analysis, are well explained as well as the way in which the context relates to the implementation of UNICEF's humanitarian action. The Theories of Change for the three components are included in annexes 1-3. The implementing agencies and specific roles of key stakeholders could be more explicitly pointed out, whereas their contributions, including UNICEF's, are detailed in the efficiency section as well as in annex 4.</b></p>		 3
<b>Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
The implementing agencies as well as their specific roles could be listed and explained in further detail.		0.05
<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		Rating
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Yes
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Yes
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%
	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention)	Yes
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b>	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Highly Satisfactory
<p><b>The intended use and end users of this evaluation are clearly listed. The report clearly indicates what the evaluation seeks to achieve and the scope of the evaluation is also clearly explained both chronologically and geographically. Also, the report provides a list of specific objectives for the evaluation along with key evaluation questions.</b></p>		 4
<b>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting

<b>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</b>		0.05
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	100%
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Yes
	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described	Yes
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	100%
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	Yes
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	Yes
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	100%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	Yes
	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	Yes
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Yes
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b>	<b>Overall rating for Section</b>
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p><b>The evaluation framework is OECD/DAC Standard criteria; is clearly described; and relevant guiding evaluation questions are provided. The evaluation clearly describes the methodology used, data sources, sampling strategies, as well as the rationale for the choices made. Also, the report explains how triangulation of several levels of evidence was carried out. Explicit reference to Humanitarian Action principles guiding the evaluation is made in the report and a description of ethical safeguards for participants is provided. Also, ethical safeguards involving interviewing children are explained, and explicit mention is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children. Similarly, the obligations of the evaluators concerning ethical issues are appropriately discussed in the report.</b></p>		 4
<b>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
<b>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</b>		0.15
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	100%
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	Yes
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Yes
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	75%

	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	<b>Yes</b>
	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.	<b>Yes</b>
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	<b>No</b>
	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	<b>Yes</b>
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	100%
	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	<b>Yes</b>
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	<b>Yes</b>
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b>	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	<b>Satisfactory</b>
	<b>The report is particularly strong at providing multiple lines of evidence that support the findings, which are presented under each evaluation criterion and in relation to the different components of the initiative evaluated. The causal factors leading to achievement or non achievement of results are clearly explained in each case. However, even if unexpected changes or unintended effects of the programme are included in the evaluation questions, these are not explicitly discussed and analysed in the report. Conversely, the evaluation provides a complete assessment of the intervention's M&amp;E system, and it explains how it was used in decision making.</b>	 <b>3</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>The evaluation should explicitly address the unexpected or unintended effects of the intervention and provide a discussion around them in order to understand what could be done differently or adapt the Logic of the intervention accordingly. It is easiest to identify this discussion if it is provided under its own sub-section.</b>	0.2

<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)</b>	Rating
---	--------

Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	100%
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	<b>Yes</b>
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	<b>Yes</b>
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	<b>Yes</b>

Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	100%
	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	<b>Yes</b>

••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b>	Overall rating for Section
------	--	----------------------------

	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
--	---	----------------------------

	<b>The Conclusions are logically derived from the findings, and provide a clear description of both strengths and weaknesses of all of the areas covered by the intervention, addressing what worked well and what did not. Also, the Conclusions provide information concerning the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future implementation of the programme. Finally, Lessons Learned are correctly identified in the report and duly generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have in different contexts.</b>	 <b>4</b>
--	--	--

	<b>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
--	--	-----------

	<b>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</b>	0.15
--	--	------

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	67%
	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Yes
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Yes
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	No
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	100%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Yes
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Yes
• • • -	<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b>	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		<b>Satisfactory</b>
<b>Recommendations are well grounded in the evaluation and logically derived from the findings and conclusions. They are presented by clearly indicating the groups they are addressed to in each case. Recommendations are useful to intended users and they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation. On the other hand, there is no discussion around the process followed in developing the recommendations and the stakeholders' level of participation in this process.</b>		 <b>3</b>
<b>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
The process followed in developing the recommendations and the stakeholders' level of participation in it should be explicitly discussed in the report so as to explain the way in which the recommendations were validated by UNICEF and its partners.		0.15

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	100%
	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers	Yes
	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)	Yes
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	100%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Yes
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes
• • • •	<b>Executive Feedback on Section G</b>	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>

<p>The report is logically structured and includes all necessary information, which is presented in a very clear fashion that makes the report easy to read and navigate. The evaluation report includes sufficient context information as well as much detail on the object of evaluation, which helps illuminate the Findings. The opening pages also include all of the necessary elements, i.e. name, timeframe, date, location, table of contents, graphs, figures, abbreviation list, and list of annexes, which is extensive and greatly enhances the overall credibility of the evaluation.</p>	 <p>4</p>
<p><b>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</b> The evaluation report observes good practices in all the aspects covered in this section. No further improvement is required.</p>	<p>Weighting 0.05</p>

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 19.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?	67%
	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation	Partly
	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Yes
	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.	Mostly
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	58%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	No
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	Partly
	Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the ToRs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)	Yes
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Missing requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	0
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	Not at all integrated 0 points
	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Not at all integrated
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	Not at all integrated 0 points
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	Not at all integrated 0 points
• - - -	<b>Executive Feedback on Section H</b>	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Unsatisfactory

<p>The evaluation describes the level of participation of stakeholders in almost all levels of the evaluation process (but does not include a description of their level of involvement during the development of the recommendations). On the other, the evaluation does not explicitly adhere to a human rights-based approach and Gender Equality principles were not addressed and mainstreamed across the evaluation questions. Also, the degree to which the intervention mainstreamed a gender perspective is not assessed by the evaluation. The style of the report does not include a gender and child-rights sensitive language, and the methodology is not gender-responsive and does not contemplate the collection of gender sensitive data. Conversely, the evaluation explains that equity was not a major focus in the design or the implementation of the initiative. Finally, GEEW is not consistently mainstreamed throughout the report and the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations do not reflect a gender analysis.</p>	 1
---	---

<b>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
<p>The evaluation should explicitly adhere to a rights-based approach and the style and language used in the report should reflect a child-rights and/or human rights sensitive approach. GEEW should be mainstreamed all across the evaluation, from the evaluation questions to the methodology and data collection tools, and a gender analysis should be incorporated throughout the findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p>	0.15	

<b>SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	Rating
---	--------

Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	100%
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	Yes
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Yes
	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	Yes

•••-	<b>Executive Feedback on Section I</b>	Overall rating for Section
------	--	----------------------------

<p>The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements</p>	Satisfactory
--	--------------

<p>The executive summary includes all necessary elements and the information is presented in a concise manner. It is possible to understand the intervention and be informed in order to make decisions by reading the executive summary without having to consult the body of the report</p>	 3
---	---

<b>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
<p>The executive summary observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</p>	0.05	

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

**OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)**

•••-	Satisfactory	 3.1
------	--------------	---

Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

**Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations**

This is a credible report that can be used with confidence. Nonetheless, there are a few areas that could be improved. Firstly, the implementing agencies as well as their specific roles should be listed and explained in greater detail. Also, the evaluation should explicitly address the unexpected or unintended effects of the intervention and provide a discussion around them. It is best to present this discussion within a separate sub-section of the report. The process followed in developing the recommendations and the stakeholders' level of participation in it should be explicitly discussed in order to demonstrate the extent to which the recommendations have been validated by UNICEF and its partners. Furthermore, the evaluation should explicitly adhere to a rights-based approach and GEEW should be mainstreamed all across the evaluation, from the evaluation questions to the methodology and data collection tools, and a gender analysis should be incorporated throughout the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Sex-disaggregated data needs to be collected and the evaluation should provide an assessment around the extent to which the program under review used a gender-sensitive approach.