

# 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 Actions - Nutrition Emergency Response in District Tharparkar, Sindh, Pakistan	
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2016/016	
<b>Region</b>	ROSA	
<b>Year of Report</b>	2016	
<b>Office</b>	Pakistan	
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Pakistan	
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes	Annex 1, 8.1
<b>Date of Review</b>	13.03.2017	
<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> )		UNICEF managed
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	<b>Health</b>	Yes
	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	No
	<b>WASH</b>	No
	<b>Nutrition</b>	Yes
	<b>Education</b>	No
	<b>Child protection</b>	Yes
	<b>Social inclusion</b>	Yes
	<b>Gender equality (cross-cutting)</b>	Yes
	<b>Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)</b>	Yes
<b>Evaluation object</b>		Country Programme
<b>Evaluation type</b>		Formative
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>		Qualitative
<b>Evaluation design</b>		Other
<b>Evaluation level</b>		Outcome
<b>Geographic Scope</b>		Other
	1 district of the country where the programme was implemented.	
<b>SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		Rating
<b>Question 1.</b>	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	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/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?	67%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Mostly
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Mostly
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Mostly
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	33%
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Partly
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Partly
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
••••	<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>Programme details have been given in section 1. This section contains the object of evaluation, targets ,information about stakeholders etc. Some statistics about gender segregation of the target group could provide a better picture. Theory of Change was not available in the program however the evaluators have tried to provide a TOC on the basis of the program.</b></p>		 3
<b>Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
Some of the details given in Executive Summary could be transferred to the main body of the report.		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 section has been well written and provides a clear picture</b></p>		 4
<b>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting

<b>Purpose and the intended users have been clearly mentioned</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	<b>Yes</b>
	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	<b>Not Rated</b>
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	<b>Yes</b>
	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	<b>Yes</b>
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	<b>Mostly</b>
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	<b>Yes</b>
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:	83%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	<b>Mostly</b>
	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)	<b>Yes</b>
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	<b>Not Rated</b>
•••	<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>Satisfactory</b>
<b>OECD-DAC evaluation criteria were adopted (section 3). Various methods for collecting data have been mentioned including FGDs with beneficiary mothers. Evaluation questions and sub questions mentioned in Annex 2. Ethical considerations available on p28. Limitations in terms of poor documentation and unapproachability of some areas due to security reasons have been mentioned</b>		 <b>3</b>
<b>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</b>		<b>Weighting</b>
Various qualitative methods have been used to collect data followed by mini surveys. While it has been mentioned that triangulation of data has been done it is not very clear how the data from various sources and methods have been triangulated and in case of differences in opinion how it has been reconciled.		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?	83%
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	<b>Yes</b>
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	<b>Mostly</b>

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.	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.	Mostly
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	Partly
	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?	83%
	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	Mostly
••••	<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	Satisfactory
	<b>Findings are related to each of the evaluation criteria. Sufficient evidence has been marshalled in arriving at each finding, though the evidence is mainly based on perceptions. Strengths and weaknesses of the programme have been analysed. The section is well written. Gender data is given on p43 and 44.</b>	 3
	<b>Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Findings are evidence-based and provide answers to the evaluation questions in general. The findings also provide shortcomings of the program as well as implementation.</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?	89%
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Yes
	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)	Mostly
	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
••••	<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	Satisfactory
	<b>Conclusions and lessons learnt are shown in separate sections, but as part of the findings. Conclusions have been well brought out from the findings.</b>	 3
	<b>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Conclusions and lessons learnt need to be in separate sections and should flow from the findings</b>	0.15
<b>SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		Rating
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	89%
	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	<b>Mostly</b>
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	83%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	<b>Mostly</b>
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	<b>Yes</b>
•••-	<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 listed in a separate section . They are clear, findings-based and prioritised.</b>	 <b>3</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Recommendations need to be prioritized and target agency for each recommendation indicated.</b>	0.15

<b>SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	Rating
---	--------

Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	83%
	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	<b>Yes</b>
	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)	<b>Mostly</b>
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	83%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	<b>Mostly</b>
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	<b>Yes</b>
•••-	<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>Fair</b>
	<b>Conclusions and lessons learned should be in standalone sections, rather than integrated into the findings section.</b>	 <b>2</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Include conclusions as a standalone section in future reports.</b>	0.05

<b>SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)</b>	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	<b>Mostly</b>

	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)	<b>Mostly</b>
	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.	<b>Mostly</b>
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	67%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	<b>Mostly</b>
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	<b>Mostly</b>
	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	<b>Mostly</b>
	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.)	<b>Mostly</b>
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Meets requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	8
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	<b>Satisfactorily integrated 2 points</b>
	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	<b>Satisfactorily integrated 2 points</b>
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	<b>Satisfactorily integrated 2 points</b>
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	<b>Satisfactorily integrated 2 points</b>
••••	<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	<b>Satisfactory</b>
	<b>The evaluation discusses the extent to which gender and equity issues were taken into account in the design and implementation of the programme . Evidence on end-user perceptions reflects gender and equity aspects</b>	 <b>3</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Gender and equity aspects could have been more strongly integrated in the analysis for the findings, conclusions and recommendations</b>	0.15
<b>SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
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	<b>Yes</b>
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	<b>Yes</b>
	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	<b>Yes</b>
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section I</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 Executive Summary contains all the essential components.</b>	 <b>3</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting

The section is well written

0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)



Satisfactory



3

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**

The analysis of data could be more elaborative. Some frequency tables could be generated from qualitative data to understand who said what about various aspects of the program. Since various methods of data collection were taken it is not very clear as to how the difference of opinions were reconciled.