

# 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 the Maternal, Newborn and Child Health Week in Nigeria	
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2016/038	
<b>Region</b>	WCAR	
<b>Year of Report</b>	2016	
<b>Office</b>	Nigeria	
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Nigeria	
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes	ANNEX 1
<b>Date of Review</b>	10/03/2017	
<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>	No
	<b>Education</b>	No
	<b>Child protection</b>	Yes
	<b>Social inclusion</b>	No
	<b>Gender equality (cross-cutting)</b>	Yes
	<b>Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)</b>	No
<b>Evaluation object</b>		Country Programme
<b>Evaluation type</b>		Summative and formative
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>		Mixed methods
<b>Evaluation design</b>		Theory-based
<b>Evaluation level</b>		Impact
<b>Geographic Scope</b>		National
<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?	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
••••	<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	Highly Satisfactory
	<b>The report describes the object of evaluation in great detail, describing the demographic and policy context in which it was conceived (1.1 and 1.2). The logical chain behind the programme is presented (2.3.2). Key stakeholders including UNICEF and their respective roles have been clearly explained (2.4, and Table 2).</b>	 4
	<b>Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>The report gives an excellent account of the details of the object of evaluation. Paragraph 2.2.1 says that the primary targets of the intervention are given in a 'companion report' which is not a part of this report. A short summary in this main report would have added value.</b>	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	Satisfactory

<p><b>(For some reason, there is no section and paragraph numbering from p25, making reference difficult). The purpose and objective (including intended users) have been presented in detail. The thematic , geographic and temporal aspects of the scope have been discussed (p 26, no para numbering).</b></p>		 3
<p><b>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</b></p>		Weighting
<p>All essential details in this section have been given</p>		0.05
<p><b>SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b></p>		Rating
Question 7.	<p>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.</p>	100%
	<p>Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation</p>	Yes
	<p>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</p>	Not Rated
Question 8.	<p>Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</p>	92%
	<p>Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope</p>	Mostly
	<p>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</p>	Yes
	<p>Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?</p>	Yes
	<p>Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?</p>	Yes
Question 9.	<p>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:</p>	83%
	<p>Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)</p>	Mostly
	<p>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)</p>	Yes
	<p>ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children</p>	Not Rated
••••	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b></p>	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><b>OECD-DAC evaluation criteria have been applied. The criteria and the relevant evaluation questions have been well presented (Table 4, pp31-35). The report refers (p 30 and p 31) to a companion report (not included) that gives details of design, sampling and methods of data collection and to Annexes 10, 11, 12 and 14, not included in the present report). A brief summary of relevant portions, if considered useful additions, could have been given as an Annex. Sampling, data collection and analysis methods are described in good detail (pp 36- 39). Limitations and method of mitigation have been presented as summary in Table 5 (pp 43-45) with a reference again to companion report for details. Reference to ethical safeguards is on p31.</b></p>		 3
<p><b>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</b></p>		Weighting
<p>The approach, design and methodology are generally well presented</p>		0.15
<p><b>SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b></p>		Rating

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	Mostly
	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.	92%
	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	Mostly
	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
••••	<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
<p><b>The findings are grouped in the report as relating to components of the programme ToC ( inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes), and do not fit directly into the framework of the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, etc. and all the questions framed in the ToRs. Otherwise, the findings are based on sound evidence drawn from multiple lines and levels of enquiry, duly triangulated. The programme's M&amp;E system has been assessed in great detail in Finding 2.8 (pp57-62).</b></p>		 3
<b>Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
It would have been useful to relate the findings to each of the evaluation questions under each of the criteria.		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	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)	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
••••	<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		Highly Satisfactory

<b>The conclusions have also been related to the components of the programme logic and are abstracted from the evidence-based findings. Lessons learnt (pp78-80) have been abstracted from the evidence and findings</b>		<b>4</b>
--	---	----------

<b>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
<b>The requirements of this section are well met by the report</b>	0.15

<b>SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	Rating
--	--------

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	100%
	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	<b>Yes</b>
	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)	<b>Yes</b>
	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>Yes</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>Yes</b>
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	<b>Mostly</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>The recommendations are clearly stated and the target organization for each identified. They are grouped as policy related and operational. No clear prioritization is however indicated</b>		<b>3</b>
---	---	----------

<b>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
<b>The recommendations could have been prioritized</b>	0.15

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

Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	67%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	<b>Partly</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>
---	-------------

<p>The report does not have a section and paragraph numbering beyond p 26, which makes navigation a little difficult. There is no prominent indication of the evaluating organization in the first few pages except a passing mention in the Foreword (and details in the Annex). There is a reference to a companion report at some places but that is not available. Inclusion of summaries of relevant material would have made this report self-contained and more informative. Annexes include ToRs, persons interviewed, documents reviewed, data collection tools and details of the evaluators. Evaluation Matrix (Table 4, p32) and Theory of Change (Fig.2, p 46) are in the body of the report. A second volume of the report seems to include many other annexes.</p>	 <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
<b>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</b>	
<p>Relevant extracts or summaries of the companion report should have been included, if that report itself cannot be added as an annex.</p>	<p>Weighting 0.05</p>

<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?	89%
	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>Yes</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>Yes</b>
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	100%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	<b>Yes</b>
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	<b>Yes</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>Yes</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>Yes</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 adequately addresses the gender and equity issues (p 31, Findings 3.1 pp 62-63, Finding 3.4, p68, .</b>	 <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>

<b>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</b>	
<p>While the evaluation addresses the gender and equity aspects, there could be a greater degree of integration of these aspects.</p>	<p>Weighting 0.15</p>

<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
	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>The Executive Summary is self-contained and can stand alone as a guide to action.</b>	 3
	<b>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting
	<b>Good Executive Summary</b>	0.05
	<i>Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1</i>	
	<b>OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)</b>	
•••-	Satisfactory	 3.15
	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence	
	<b>Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations</b>	
	It would have been advantageous to lay down the findings against each evaluation question framed. The report could have been structured better with proper section and paragraph numbering and made self-contained through inclusion of all important annexures. If there are two volumes, the two should be presented together	