

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2016.4

Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	Communication for Development: An Evaluation of UNICEF's Capacity and Action - Case study report for Kyrgyzstan	
Report sequence number	2016/999	
Region	CEE/CIS	
Year of Report	2016	
Office	Evaluation Office	
Coverage (countries)	Rep of Kyrgyzstan	
ToRs present	Yes	
Date of Review	12/01/2017	
Name of reviewer	ImpactReady (incl. Merits)	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)		UNICEF managed
SPOA Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	Health	Yes
	HIV/AIDS	Yes
	WASH	Yes
	Nutrition	Yes
	Education	Yes
	Child protection	Yes
	Social inclusion	Yes
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object		Strategy
Evaluation type		Formative
Evaluation strategy		Qualitative
Evaluation design		Case study
Evaluation level		Output
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/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Mostly
	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?	33%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Partly
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Partly
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Partly
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	83%
	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	Mostly
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	50%
	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	Partly
••••	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	Fair
	The evaluation report presents the "Communication for Development (C4D)" Strategy in a satisfactory manner. The theory of change behind the strategy is explained, though more information can be found in the ToR than in the report about its origins and rationale. Also information about the context and beneficiaries needs are quite implicit, providing the Background section mainly information about the Country Office (not about the country itself). The strategy involves mainly internal stakeholders but a more explicit analysis and description of their roles, included the C4D Unit would have been helpful.	 2
	Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	Further information on the origin and rationale behind the strategy, about the local context and needs that justify its relevance and about the roles of the different stakeholders would have enriched the section.	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?	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
••••	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 report describes reasonably well the objectives and purpose of the evaluation and it frames it in the particular timing it is conducted. Although it is clear how UNICEF will use the results, maybe the report could have been more specific regarding who within the organization will be the main users.	 3

Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
Provide some more detail about the specific users.		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.	67%
	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	Partly
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	83%
	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	Mostly
	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?	Mostly
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:	17%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	No
	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)	Partly
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Not Rated
•••	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
<p>The report describes the methodological part in section 1.3 and successfully explains the evaluation approach and methods for collection and analysis. However, the reviewer missed further reference to UNICEF Evaluation Standards and Guidelines, explicit reference of the evaluators obligations, and deeper analysis of the ethical issues and limitations confronted while conducting the evaluation.</p>		 3
Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
Further explain how the nature of the evaluand determined the choice of the evaluation framework and methods, and include more explicit reference to Human Rights based and Gender-sensitive approaches.		0.15
SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		Rating
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	67%
	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	Partly

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.	Yes
	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).	Mostly
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	33%
	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)	Partly
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Partly
• • • -	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	Satisfactory
	The evaluation findings cover the main evaluation questions and areas and provide with sufficient levels of evidence. However, given the nature of the object (a strategy that - according to the Executive summary and the conclusions regarding Evaluability - was not sufficiently defined in terms of indicators and causal mechanisms) it was challenging for the evaluation team to make much links with the monitoring system. Unexpected results do not seem to have been explicitly explored.	 3
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	Exploring unexpected results is required in UNICEF evaluations.	0.2
SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		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
• • • •	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	Highly Satisfactory

The conclusions derived properly from the findings and provide a good description of positive and negative aspects of the strategy. Lessons learned are identified in the findings section, at the end of each of the four areas looked by the evaluators.		4
Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)		
No comments.		
		Weighting 0.15

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating
--	--------

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	78%
	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	Partly
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	33%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Partly
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Partly

••••	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 provide with interesting insights about how to improve the design and implementation of the C4D strategy. The target group and their priorities are however not clearly specified.		3
Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)		
More clear traceability between findings, conclusions and recommendations could be interesting. More clear details on the target group and priorities of the 12 recommendations provided.		
		Weighting 0.15

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	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	Mostly
	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?	67%

	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Partly
	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
	<p>The report is overall well structured and including all information needed to understand the evaluation. However, the structure of the findings is at times confusing in several regards: they are not structured following the standard 5 criteria, in the green box introducing Section 3. Findings in page 11 it mentions how the section is divided in 8 parts for immediately later, in the paragraph before section 3.1. saying that it is divided in 4; section 3.1.1. according to the green box should be Effectiveness, 3.1.2. Efficiency, when in reality it is Relevance and Effectiveness (in page 12 and on), etc.</p> <p>ToR mention that an external evaluation team will be brought in, but according to the report it would seem as if it is an internal evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Office in New York.</p>	 3
	Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	When introducing the parts within sections, keep a coherent description with the body of the report.	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?	22%
	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)	No
	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?	25%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Partly
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	Partly
	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.)	No
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Missing requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	3
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	Partially integrated 1 point
	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Partially integrated 1 point
	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	Not at all integrated 0 points
••••	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	Unsatisfactory

<p>Given the nature of the evaluation object, a strategy to mainstreamed effective communication principles and tools in order to improve participation and inclusion and individuals to take part in decisions that affect them and their development, equity and gender issues are implicitly present as participation and inclusion are 2 of their main principles too. Gender is made explicit mentioned in the evaluation evidence matrix, where some questions are specifically asking about the gender-sensitivity of the strategy and its implementation. However, no further gender analysis and tools and reference to Human Rights questions or international conventions can be clearly found in the rest of the document</p>	 1
Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	
<p>Make a more explicit effort of making gender, equity and human rights issues more visible within the evaluation report.</p>	Weighting 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	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	Mostly
•••-	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
	<p>The report includes an executive summary that provides the reader a good summary of the document. The conclusions are often a repetition from the report and the 12 recommendations are listed without any further categorization (while in Section 5 they are grouped by each of the 4 main areas the evaluation looked into (Capacity development, Integration, Implementation and Evaluability)).</p>	 3
Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)		
<p>Redact the conclusions in a similar but different way than what's collected in the report.</p>	Weighting 0.05	

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)			
	Satisfactory	 2.8	
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 report satisfactorily fulfils UNICEF's evaluation standards, though it could have been more explicit in quite a few issues that it seems to take for granted.