



# 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>	Evaluación de implementación estrategia Retorno de la Alegría para la niñez migrante en Honduras	
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2017/001	
<b>Region</b>	LACR	
<b>Year of Report</b>	2017	
<b>Office</b>	Honduras	
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Honduras	
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes	
<b>Date of Review</b>	26/09/2017	
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	ImpactReady	
<b>Classification of Evaluation Report</b>		
<b>Management of Evaluation</b> ( <i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i> )		<b>UNICEF managed</b>
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	<b>Health</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>WASH</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Nutrition</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Education</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Child protection</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Social inclusion</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Gender equality (cross-cutting)</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Evaluation object</b>		<b>Strategy</b>
<b>Evaluation type</b>		<b>Summative and formative</b>
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>		<b>Mixed methods</b>
<b>Evaluation design</b>		<b>Participatory</b>
<b>Evaluation level</b>		<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Geographic Scope</b>		<b>National</b>
<b>SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</b>	<b>78%</b>
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	<b>Yes</b>


	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	<b>Yes</b>
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	<b>Partly</b>
<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</b>	<b>89%</b>
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	<b>Mostly</b>
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	<b>Yes</b>
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	<b>Yes</b>
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?</b>	<b>83%</b>
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	<b>Yes</b>
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	<b>Mostly</b>
<b>...</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</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>La sección de antecedentes proporciona buena información contextual sobre la escala y la naturaleza de los temas, las organizaciones involucradas y sus funciones, y los beneficiarios. Se explica la estrategia, incluyendo su racionalidad e historia. Hay discusión sobre los resultados previstos y una teoría del cambio que ha sido desarrollada por los evaluadores.</b>		 <b>3</b>
<b>Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
-		0.05


<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>	<b>83%</b>
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	<b>Yes</b>
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	<b>Mostly</b>
<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>	<b>83%</b>
	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	<b>Mostly</b>
	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)	<b>Yes</b>
<b>...</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</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>El propósito de la evaluación y su importancia estratégica para el futuro se esbozan. Se especifican los usuarios de la evaluación, pero esto es por organización y podría ser más específico (incluyendo departamentos). Los tres objetivos son específicos y claros. La expectativa en términos de lo que se espera se alcance al final de la evaluación se establece, aunque no hay referencia a los Términos de Referencia. El alcance de la evaluación está claramente definido (geografía, beneficiarios, tema).</b>		 <b>3</b>
<b>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting

	-	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.	67%
	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>Partly</b>
Question 8.	<b>Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>	75%
	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>Partly</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:	33%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	<b>Partly</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>Mostly</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>No</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>Fair</b>
<p><b>Se utilizan los criterios del CAD de la OCDE, pero no hay ninguna explicación de por qué no se incluye el criterio de Impacto. Incluye también criterios humanitarios (adecuación y cobertura), así como el criterio de equidad. La estrategia de muestreo se establece, pero también se explican las limitaciones en la realidad que es una preocupación de la evaluación. Se podría haber escrito más sobre análisis de datos y triangulación. El género no se considera suficientemente dentro de la metodología.</b></p> <p><b>En cuanto a las preocupaciones éticas, existe una clara sensibilidad a las necesidades / sensaciones de las entrevistas. También hay un formulario de consentimiento. Hay menos discusión sobre "normas", es decir, independencia, imparcialidad, credibilidad y los procedimientos del UNICEF.</b></p>		2
<b>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
<p><b>Consulte las directrices del UNEG para realizar evaluaciones</b>  <a href="http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102">http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102</a></p>		0.15
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
Question 10.	<b>Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?</b>	100%
	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>Yes</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.	83%

	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	<b>Mostly</b>
	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.	<b>Yes</b>
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	<b>Yes</b>
	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	<b>Mostly</b>
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	<b>83%</b>
	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	<b>Yes</b>
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	<b>Mostly</b>
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section D</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>Los resultados se basan en la gama de fuentes de la evaluación y triangulan los datos. Se analiza el sistema de monitoreo interno. Los resultados se presentan de manera equilibrada, explicando tanto los resultados positivos como los negativos. También se discuten los efectos inesperados. El uso de los datos de monitoreo está incluido pero no en gran medida en la toma de decisiones.</b>	 <b>3</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting 0.2
	–	
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	<b>89%</b>
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	<b>Yes</b>
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	<b>Mostly</b>
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	<b>Yes</b>
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	<b>100%</b>
	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	<b>Yes</b>
•••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b>	<b>Overall rating for Section</b>
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
	<b>Las conclusiones están bien escritas y se derivan lógicamente de los hallazgos. Estas presentan tanto las fortalezas del proyecto como las áreas de mejora, están formuladas y dirigidas a un nivel apropiado a la vez que presentan una mirada hacia el futuro.</b>	 <b>4</b>
	<b>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting 0.15
	–	
<b>SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>

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	Mostly
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	67%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Mostly
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Mostly
••••	<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		Satisfactory
<p><b>Las recomendaciones son enfocadas, estratégicas y presentadas como ideas a corto y largo plazo. Se centran en cuestiones fundamentales como la institucionalización del gobierno de la metodología, la propia metodología, los sistemas de monitoreo y otros. Podrían proporcionarse más detalles sobre el proceso de elaboración de las recomendaciones. Mencionan amablemente las organizaciones involucradas. Hubiera sido útil dar prioridad a las recomendaciones, así como presentar el calendario relativo. Prioridad a mediano plazo</b></p>		 3
<b>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
Favor de priorizar las recomendaciones. También sería útil incluir claramente una lista de partes interesadas responsables de cada recomendación (para que sea inmediatamente clara para los lectores). Además, sería útil incluir un sistema de numeración a través del informe que muestre qué conclusiones llevan a las conclusiones y recomendaciones para mostrar la lógica coherente que atraviesa el documento.		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	Yes
	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)	Yes
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	100%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Yes
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes
••••	<b>Executive Feedback on Section G</b>	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Highly Satisfactory
<p><b>El informe está bien estructurado (sigue las expectativas de UNICEF) y muy bien presentado. Las páginas iniciales incluyen el nombre del tema de la evaluación, la fecha del informe, la organización evaluadora. Hay una lista completa de acrónimos. La lista de contenidos incluye figuras y anexos. Los anexos son suficientes y comprenden los Términos de Referencia, el marco de evaluación, los instrumentos de recopilación de datos y el formulario de consentimiento.</b></p>		 4
<b>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting


-		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?	33%
	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>Partly</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>Partly</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>Partly</b>
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	42%
	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>Partly</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>Partly</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>Partly</b>
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Approaches requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	4
	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>Partially integrated 1 point</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>Partially integrated 1 point</b>
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	<b>Partially integrated 1 point</b>
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	<b>Partially integrated 1 point</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>Fair</b>
<p><b>En la metodología se mencionan criterios humanitarios (adecuación y cobertura). Sin embargo, hay poco más allá en términos de principios humanitarios.</b></p> <p><b>En lo que respecta a la equidad, el enfoque es de los emigrantes retornados con una buena comprensión de sus niveles de pobreza y los factores impulsores de la migración. Se establecieron perfiles de los diferentes grupos.</b></p> <p><b>El género se considera dentro de la metodología en términos de la disponibilidad de datos desagregados por género. Se podría haber hecho más por grupos de enfoque desagregados para entender más sobre la dimensión de género. El género se incluye en la matriz de evaluación en la medida en que separa a los niños y niñas de las preguntas e indicadores de evaluación, sin embargo, hay muy poco que refleje diferentes temas (o problemas potenciales) para niños y niñas en un nivel más profundo. Se reconoce el número diferencial de migrantes (mayor para los niños), sin embargo, no se discuten las diferentes cuestiones que enfrentan o potencialmente enfrentan los niños migrantes y las niñas migrantes. Las conclusiones de la evaluación se refieren en gran medida a los "niños" en general o pueden decir "niños y niñas" en lugar de desagregar.</b></p>		 2
<b>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting

Por favor consulte la información SWAP de la ONU <http://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/how%20we%20work/unsystemcoordination/un-swap-framework-dec-2012.pdf?la=es&vs=1441>


También, por favor, para más información sobre el análisis de género, consulte [http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/gender\\_analysis](http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/gender_analysis)

Desafortunadamente no he encontrado estos recursos en español.

0.15

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		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	Highly Satisfactory
	El resumen ejecutivo puede leerse como un resumen del informe, que está bien estructurado, claro y conciso.	 4
<b>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting
-		0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)		
•••-	Satisfactory	 2.95
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>		
-		