GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2018.1

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	**Formative Evaluation of the Child Rights Monitoring Programme in Uzbekistan 2016-2018**	
Report sequence number	**2018/001**	
Region	**ECAR**	
Year of Report	**2018**	
Office	**Rep of Uzbekistan**	
Coverage (countries)	**Uzbekistan**	
ToRs present	**Yes**	
Date of Review	**2/25/2019**	
Name of reviewer	**ImpactReady**	

Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*		**UNICEF managed**
SPOA Corresponde nce *(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)*	**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		**Programme**
Evaluation type		**Formative**
Evaluation strategy		**Mixed methods**
Evaluation design		**Theory-based**
Evaluation level		**Outcome**
Geographic Scope		**National**

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		89%
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	89%
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	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?	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?	67%
	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	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		Satisfactory
The report clearly describes the object of evaluation, including the projects making up the assessed programme, its timeline and implementation status, as well as its geographic coverage and budget. The report provides a good overview of the institutions directly benefitting from the programme and their role in national child rights monitoring (CRM) mechanisms. The report provides a good description of the programme's expected outputs and outcomes, and a theory of change which includes underlying assumptions and risks is presented in both a narrative and diagram format in Appendix 8.3. Additionally, the report includes a section which explains the positioning of the CRM Programme within UNICEF's overall Country Programme in Uzbekistan. However, while key partners are identified, their roles and responsibilities in programme implementation are not clearly defined. Also, the rights-holders and the specific areas covered by the initiative could be better described.		3
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
The report could be improved by describing the roles and responsibilities (i.e., technical, financial, etc.) of stakeholders in programme implementation. This could potentially be done using a table format. Also, the specific rights-holder groups and the areas covered by the initiative, (i.e. education, health, social inclusion, etc.), could have been more explicitly described in the report.		0.05

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		100%
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

● ● ● ●	**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		Highly Satisfactory

The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described. It seeks to produce knowledge and recommendations at a critical point in time, as UNICEF is at mid-point in its Country Programme in Uzbekistan and is embarking on a new Strategic Plan. Evaluation findings are also expected to inform the Government's new agenda as it is pursuing collaboration with civil society. The report clearly identifies primary users and explains how each user is expected to use the evaluation findings and recommendations. The objectives of the evaluation are clearly stated, as are the timeline and geographic scope. The report also specifies that the timeline covered by the evaluation was revised from the timeline originally proposed in the ToRs as the former better aligns with the purpose of the evaluation.		4
Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting	
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.05	

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	100%	
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	100%
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Yes
	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described	Yes
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	100%
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	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?	Yes
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	100%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	Yes
	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)	Yes
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Yes
•••• **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	**Highly Satisfactory**	
The evaluation uses a strong methodological approach that draws on multiple data sources. The report clearly presents the evaluation's design, methods, data sources and sampling methods and provides an independent justification for their selection. The report also provides a valid explanation as to why the HRBA criterion is addressed, in addition to standard OECD-DAC criteria. Additionally, the report presents the evaluation questions and explains that these have been slightly modified from those proposed in the ToRs following the results of an evaluability assessment. Limitations are also clearly discussed, as are their accompanying mitigation strategies. Finally, the report is strong at describing ethical safeguards and makes explicit reference to UNICEF's International Charter on Ethical Research Involving Children. Ethical obligations of the evaluators are also explicitly mentioned. The annexes include a consent form which explains in plain language data confidentiality and the rights of children in data collection, as well as protocols to report cases of serious harm identified by the evaluators.)		4
Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting	
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.15	

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)	97%	
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	100%
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	Yes
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Yes
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	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
•••– **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 report presents robust findings that are triangulated with multiple data sources. Findings are structured around the evaluation questions and sub-questions, which makes it easy for the reader to understand the extent to which evaluation questions were answered. Both positive and negative findings are discussed, as are the key factors enabling or hindering programme effectiveness. Furthermore, the report makes use of the ToC and its results statements to show progression toward the achievement of outputs and outcomes. While the report presents one unintended positive result, it is unclear whether the programme has produced any negative unexpected results. Finally, the report explains that the programme lacks a results framework with baseline, targets, indicators and methods for measuring progress.		3
Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting	
It is important to ensure that the findings clearly present both positive and negative unexpected results. To ensure that this information is presented, an evaluation question to that effect could be included in the evaluation matrix. Should there be no negative unintended consequences, the report should mention this explicitly.	0.2	

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		100%

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
Conclusions are strong and provide a thorough overview of the programme's main strengths and weaknesses. The conclusions are clearly linked to the evaluation findings and provide analytical, forward-looking insights that prepare the reader for the recommendations ahead. Lessons learned are insightful and formulated in such a way that they can be applied to other contexts.		4

Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.15

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		100%

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	100%
	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Yes
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Yes
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	Yes
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	100%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Yes
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Yes

••••	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		Highly Satisfactory
Recommendations are logically drawn from the findings and conclusions. They are sufficiently detailed and provide a good explanation of how they can be implemented. Recommendations are also targeted and prioritized. Finally, the report states that recommendations were validated during a workshop attended by UNICEF and key government ministries, therefore reflecting stakeholder involvement. Appendix 8.11 lists the participants and explains how recommendations were revised following the workshop.		4

Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.15

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		92%

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?	83%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles	Mostly
	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
The report is logically structured and includes all of the key elements that are expected from a standard evaluation report. The opening pages include key information such as the name of the evaluated object, its timeframe, its geographic location, as well as the name of the commissioning organization and those of the evaluators. Furthermore, the annexes include all of the necessary elements (e.g., ToRs, ToC, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, ethics protocols, etc.) that add significant credibility to the report. However, in the findings section there are limited sub-sections and key finding statements are not easily identified.		3

Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
To help the reader to quickly grasp the main findings, the evaluators could add bold statements that provide succinct answers to the evaluation questions. The use of numbered sub-sections would also make the report more reader-friendly.	0.05

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		100%

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?	100%
	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation	Yes
	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Yes

	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.	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	**Yes**
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	**Yes**
	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.)	**Yes**
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Meets requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	9
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	GEEW is integrated in the **evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions** are designed in a way that ensures GEEW related data will be collected	**Fully integrated 3 points**
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	A gender responsive **methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis** techniques are selected.	**Fully integrated 3 points**
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The evaluation **findings, conclusions and recommendations** reflect a gender analysis.	**Fully integrated 3 points**
• • • • **Executive Feedback on Section H**		Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly 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). The rater should include one labelled sentence for each of the UN-SWAP criteria.		**Highly Satisfactory**
The report makes abundant mention of the use of a rights-based framework such as the CRC and CEDAW, and the way that equity and gender equality were included in the design and implementation of the initiative is addressed throughout the report. Also, the report provides a good explanation of the level of involvement of stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation at different stages, which seems aligned with their involvement in the implementation of the initiative. The evaluation also includes an evaluation criterion on cross-cutting issues, including equity and gender equality, and several questions on gender-related issues make part of the evaluation scope of analysis. Furthermore, the methodology made sure that sex-odisaggregated data was collected, and several efforts were deployed to ensure the participation of both boys and girls in the evaluation process. Finally, a gender analysis is presented that cascades down through the different sections of the report.		4
Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings		
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	The evaluation matrix includes a question on cross-cutting issues that mentions gender equality and indicators accompanying other questions integrate gender considerations.	
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	The methodology presents a good explanation of specific methods and tools used to ensure that sex-disaggregated data was collected and to facilitate the participation of both boys and girls. To ensure the collection of sex-disaggregated qualitative data, focus groups were conducted with boys and girls separately.	
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The findings, conclusions and recommendations provide a consistent gender analysis. The findings and conclusions provide a good analysis of the extent to which the CRM programme is contributing to generating sex-disaggregated data and the report provides a recommendation for improvement in this area.	
Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.		0.15

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		78%
Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	78%
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	**Partly**
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	**Yes**
	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	**Yes**
• • • – **Executive Feedback on Section I**		Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		**Satisfactory**
The executive summary includes all of the necessary elements to provide end users with a good understanding of the initiative and of the evaluation. Also, the executive summary only includes information that is further developed in the body of the report. On the other hand, with 13 pages, the executive summary is excessively lengthy and this my hinder its effectiveness in informing high-level users.		3
Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
It is good practice for the executive summary to not exceed 6 pages so as to effectively inform high-level end users who may not have time to read more than that. The information included in the executive summary needs to, therefore, be further synthetized.		0.05
Weighting checksum (should equal 1)	1	

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)		
• • • • **Highly Satisfactory**		3.65
Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence		
Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations		

The is a very high quality evaluation report that, for the mot part, observes good practices and can be used with confidence by decision-makers. It is, however, important that the existence and functions of an Evaluation Reference Group, as stated in the ToRs, be explicitly discussed in the report as this increases the credibility of the evaluation by portraying the participatory nature of the entire process. Also, it is important to emphasize the utility of including an analysis of unintended results or, in the case that none have been observed, it is recommended to explicitly state this in the report. To ensure that both negative and positive unexpected results are clearly discussed, UNICEF could include a question in this regard in the ToRs.