

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2018.1

Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	Formative Evaluation of Be A Change Agent Project	
Report sequence number	2018/001	
Region	WCAR	
Year of Report	2018	
Office	Liberia	
Coverage (countries)	Liberia	
ToRs present	Yes	
Date of Review	2/6/2019	
Name of reviewer	ImpactReady	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>		UNICEF managed
SPOA	Health	Yes
Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	HIV/AIDS	Yes
	WASH	No
	Nutrition	No
	Education	Yes
	Child protection	Yes
	Social inclusion	Yes
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object		Project
Evaluation type		Formative
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods

Evaluation design		Quasi-experimental
Evaluation level		Outcome
Geographic Scope		National
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		100%
Question 1.	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
••••	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		Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report does a good job at describing the object of the evaluation including the rationale for the implementation of the project as well as for the selection of different types of beneficiaries. The initiative's timeline, location and budget as well as the implementing partners involved in the project and their contributions are also described in detail. The report provides a complete description of the socioeconomic and political context in Liberia and the way it had a bearing on the project design an implementation. Similarly, the project's results framework is clearly presented and the report verbally explains the underlying Theory of Change (ToC) for the initiative, explaining the change pathway and the causal chain but also pointing out the fact that it may be somewhat too ambitious.</p>		 4
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
This section observes good practices. For clarity purposes, however, it is recommended to present a graphic representation of the ToC along with the verbal description.		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
<p>The report clearly explains the primary purpose of the evaluation as generating evidence to inform and improve B-CAP's implementation in its second phase. Also, the report does a good job at specifying the intended primary users of the evaluation, i.e. relevant national ministries such as the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection, Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education etc.; UNICEF Liberia and UNICEF West Central Africa Office; civil society organisations; etc. Similarly, the report provides a complete description of the scope of the evaluation in thematic, chronological and geographic terms, and the objectives of the evaluation are discussed and clearly stated.</p>		 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%)		89%
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:	67%
	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	No
••••	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
	The report clearly describes the evaluation criteria, which are in line with the OECD/standards, and a complete discussion is presented around the criteria selected as well as the rationale for the exclusion of the impact criterion. In addition to some key evaluation questions presented in the body of the report, a complete evaluation matrix is presented in Annex B. The report does a good job at describing in detail the methodology used including the use of mixed methods, triangulation and data analysis methods, and the rationale used for the sampling strategies in each case. Furthermore, the report provides a list of methodological limitations and potential bias along with mitigation strategies used to overcome them or minimize their impact on the research. The report does a good job at explaining the ethical considerations applied throughout the evaluation process and describes the ethical obligations of the evaluators according to the UNEG guidelines. However, even if the report explains that it applied UNICEF Procedures for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis, there is no explicit mentioning of the UNICEF Procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	 3
	Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	The methodology observes good practices. However, as the evaluation conducted interviews with adolescents, it is important that explicit mention be made of the use of the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children, which is a central element in UNICEF's evaluation standards.	0.15
SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		100%
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.	100%
	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	Yes
	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	Highly Satisfactory
	The report presents findings that are robust, and several lines of evidence are provided to support them. Also, the findings are clearly presented in four subsections, which correspond to each of the four evaluation criteria. They respond to key evaluation questions in each case, and both the initiative's successes as well as areas for improvement are presented. Furthermore, the report does a good job at presenting findings that clearly indicate the causal factors that influenced the achievement and non-achievement of results. Although unintended effects of the intervention are discussed, these are scattered throughout the findings section and are not clearly presented within their own subsection along with a proper analysis of their possible consequences.	 4
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	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

<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>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>
<p>The report presents conclusions that are appropriately drawn from the findings and they refer to both the strengths and weaknesses of the initiative. The conclusions are presented as boxes at the end of each sub section in the Findings (under relevance, effectiveness, etc.) and a short summary of them are presented in the proper Conclusions section. The conclusions appropriately make reference to future implications that are foreseeable at the moment the evaluation was conducted. Finally, lessons learned are correctly identified and presented so as to signify what wider relevance they might have in different contexts.</p>	<p> 4</p>
<p>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</p>	
<p>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</p>	<p>Weighting 0.15</p>

<p>SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</p>	<p>100%</p>
---	-------------

<p>Question 15.</p>	<p>Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?</p>	<p>100%</p>
	<p>Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 16.</p>	<p>Are recommendations clearly presented?</p>	<p>100%</p>
	<p>Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>••••</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section F</p>	<p>Overall rating for Section</p>
-------------	---	-----------------------------------

<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>	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p>
<p>The report presents recommendations that are correctly drawn from the findings, conclusions and lessons learned and are conveniently listed in a table format. Recommendations are divided into strategic and operational ones, clearly indicating the addressee group(s) in each case. Also, the process followed in developing and validating the recommendations is explained including the level of stakeholder participation within this process. Finally, recommendations are numbered and they indicate the priority level in terms of their implementation.</p>	<p> 4</p>
<p>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</p>	
	<p>Weighting</p>

This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.		0.15
SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		100%
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
••••	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		Highly Satisfactory
The opening pages of the report contain all of the necessary elements to readily provide the most essential information concerning the object of evaluation and the evaluation itself. For instance, the opening pages clearly indicate the name of the initiative, period of time to be evaluated, location and submission date of the report, name of the commissioning organization, evaluators, as well as the table of contents, lists of figures, tables, and acronyms, etc. Similarly, the report includes annexes that greatly increase the overall credibility of the report with elements such as the ToRs, the initiative's results framework, the matrix of the evaluation, list of interviewees, among many others. Finally, the report has a clear structure and the standard order of sections is observed, which makes its navigation easy and straightforward.		 4
Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.		0.05
SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		96%

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	8
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.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 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.	Satisfactory
	The report states that all research conducted was guided by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, in particular Article 3.1 with the ultimate consideration being the wellbeing of the child. Similarly, the report uses a rights-based approach and human rights considerations are evident in each stage of the evaluation with references to this consistently presented throughout the report. The level of stakeholder participation in the consultation and validation process is also duly discussed in the report and the existence of an evaluation reference group is explicitly mentioned. With the B-CAP initiative being a project conceived to empower girls, the scope of the evaluation integrates GEEW and an analysis of the gender transformative aspects of the project is mainstreamed throughout the report. Similarly, the report explains that the methodology of the evaluation mainstreamed gender, equity and human rights, although the report does not explain in detail the specific ways in which gender was mainstreamed in this sense.	 3
Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings		

UN-SWAP criterion 1:	The evaluation included gender-related questions and given the very nature of the object of the evaluation, GEEW was fully integrated in the scope of analysis, and gender-related data makes the bulk of the evidence collected through the evaluation process.
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	The report explains that the methodology used mainstreamed gender and the level of participation of women as data sources in the evaluation is described. However, the methodology does not provide much detail of the specific ways gender was actually mainstreamed, e.g. how women were approached, any special considerations to ensure the participation of boys, etc.
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The report presents a gender analysis of the B-CAP initiative that is consistent throughout all of the sections of the report.

Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
It is important that the report explain in as much detail as possible the ways in which the evaluation used a gender-sensitive methodology with data collection methods, tools and data analyses that both ensured the participation of girls and boys and that also paid attention to cater to the specific needs of both groups.	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	Yes
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Mostly
	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
---	---------------------

The report includes an executive summary that is concise and provides a good understanding of the evaluation including its purpose, methodology, key findings, lessons learned and recommendations. However, the executive summary provides an extremely short overview of the object of the evaluation and its locations and timeline are not mentioned.	 3
---	--

Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
It is recommended that the object of the evaluation be described in as much detail as possible and important elements such as the location(s) of the initiative, its timeline and major stakeholders involved should be mentioned.	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

This is a high quality evaluation report that can be used by decision makers with confidence. The findings and recommendations are robust and present different levels of evidence to support the assertions made. The report is also strong at covering the ethical safeguards used in the conduct of the evaluation. However, in the future, it is recommended that explicit mention be made of UNICEF Procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children. It is also recommended that the evaluation manager provide guidance to the evaluation team around the need to articulate how a methodology is gender sensitive.