GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2016.4

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	**Comprehensive Evaluation of The Community Health Program in Rwanda**	
Report sequence number	**2016/004**	
Region	**ESAR**	
Year of Report	**2016**	
Office	**Rwanda**	
Coverage (countries)	**Rwanda**	
ToRs present	**No**	**Stated to be in Annex 1, but no Annexes are present in the**
Date of Review	**08/01.2017**	
Name of reviewer	**ImpactReady (incl. Merits)**	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*		**UNICEF managed**
SPOA Correspondence *(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)*	**Health**	**Yes**
	HIV/AIDS	**No**
	WASH	**No**
	Nutrition	**No**
	Education	**No**
	Child protection	**Yes**
	Social inclusion	**Yes**
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	**Yes**
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	**No**
Evaluation object		**Country Programme**
Evaluation type		**Summative**
Evaluation strategy		**Qualitative**
Evaluation design		**Theory-based**
Evaluation level		**Outcome**
Geographic Scope		**National**
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	89%
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes

	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/cites, 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)	**Mostly**	
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?		100%
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	**Yes**	
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	**Yes**	

• • • • **Executive Feedback on Section A**	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**
Object of evaluation is described in great detail. The logical Framework of the intervention is presented (Fig 7, p26) . A ToC is developed. Project background and its components, and the policy environment have been discussed in detail. Various stakeholders have been well identified. This section has been written very well.	4
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
N/A	0.05

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	Rating

Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		83%
	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	**Mostly**	
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		83%
	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)	**Mostly**	

• • • – **Executive Feedback on Section 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**
The purpose, scope and its justification (thematic, temporal and geographical) and intended users of the evaluation are given (p29-30) . Objectives are given as per ToRs .While it has been written that objectives etc. are as per ToRs and Annex also shows indicates it but Annex documents are not attached. Rationale of the scope has been detailed.	3
Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting

	Copy of the Annexes could help in better review.		0.05

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)		Rating
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	**Not Rated**
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	92%
	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)?	**Mostly**
	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:	67%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	**Mostly**
	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)	**Mostly**
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	**Mostly**
• • • -	**Executive Feedback on Section C**	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**
Mention is made of adherence to UNEG standards (including ethics) and the manner in which it is done is given (Table 5, p32). The evaluation criteria (OECD-DAC), are clearly and elaborately specified . Evaluation design is based on ToC and contribution analysis. Primary and secondary data sources are described elaborately as are sampling methods. A mixed methodology approach (including contribution analysis) has been followed. Ethical issues have been mentioned (p 38,44,45). An evaluation matrix is given in Table 6 (p36). Coverage indicates the number of female community members. Limitations and mitigating methods)are discussed and presented clearly (Table 7, pp45-46)The section is well written.		3
.		Weighting
The methodology section of the report has been elaborated in regard to evaluation questions etc. . Details are stated to have been mentioned to be in Annex . Annex not available, but sufficient		0.15

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		Rating
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.	100%

	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	**Yes**
	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.	**Yes**
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	**Yes**
	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).	**Yes**
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)	Yes
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Yes
• • • •	**Executive Feedback on Section D**	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**
The evaluation seeks to answer all the questions . The findings are clear and direct on various relevant issues. Data analysis has been well presented with data Tables and graphs for better understanding. Both quantitative and qualitative data has been analysed using contribution analysis. A detailed cost analysis is also available (Findings 5.2 to 5.5, pp87-92). The reporting system of the programme is also evaluated (P95).		4
Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
The section well written. Data analysis is excellent.		0.2

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	78%
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	**Partly**
	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)	**Yes**
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	**Yes**
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.	**Yes**
• • • -	**Executive Feedback on Section E**	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**
Conclusions and lessons learnt are logically derived from findings, and point to the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. The performance of the programme in respect of each evaluation criterion has also been rated as specified in the ToRs. The conclusions indicate the specific recommendations to which they led. However, the conclusions do not seem to be much above the level of findings. Lessons learnt are better abstractions.		3
Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting

The conclusions should go beyond findings and need to be more general than findings.	0.15

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	100%
	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	**Yes**
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	83%
	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	**Mostly**

• • • -	**Executive Feedback on Section F**	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**
The recommendations are derived logically from the conclusions. In fact each recommendation is specifically linked to a conclusion. The agency responsible for each recommendation has also been indicated.		3

Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
Prioritization of recommendations would have added value	0.15

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	Rating
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	67%
	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)	**Partly**
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**

• • • -	**Executive Feedback on Section G**	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**

Annexes not available although listed in the report, Inclusion of Annexes and Executive Summary would have raised the review to Highly Satisfactory level.		**3**

Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
Inclusion of Annexes would have added value to the report and helped in a better review.	0.05

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	**Yes**
	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)	**Mostly**
	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.	**Partly**
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	75%
	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	**Yes**
	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.)	**Mostly**
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Approaches requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	6
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	**Satisfactorily integrated 2 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.	**Satisfactorily integrated**
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	**Partially integrated 1 point**
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	**Partially integrated 1 point**
• • - - **Executive Feedback on Section H**		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		**Fair**
The evaluation is weak in integrating gender mainly because of non-availability of gender-segregated data from the monitoring system. This deficiency should be made good by evaluator through investigations and FGDs.		**2**

Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
Monitoring systems should pay attention to equity and gender aspects adequately.	0.15

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	Rating
Question 22. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	89%
An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	**Mostly**
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**

• • • - **Executive Feedback on Section I**	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**
The excutive summary is provide separately to the main report. It contains all the essential elements, but is rather long (10 pages).	3

Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
The executive summary could have been more concise to enhance usefulness.	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
Sound monitoring systems should be instilled in the programmes to generate appropriate data likely to be needed by evaluations. The evaluators should try to correct the deficiencies if any through relevant quantitative or qualitative field investigations. **Inclusion of Annexes would have further enhanced the value of the evaluation.**