GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2018.1

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" style="text-align:center">Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Notes for QA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td><td>Evaluation of a Postnatal Home Visiting Program for mothers, neonates and their families in Gaza, State of Palestine, over the period 2011 – 2016</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Report sequence number</td><td>2018/003</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Region</td><td>MENA</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Year of Report</td><td>2018</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Office</td><td>State of Palestine</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Coverage (countries)</td><td>State of Palestine</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ToRs present</td><td>Yes</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Date of Review</td><td>8/7/2018</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of reviewer</td><td>ImpactReady</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Classification of Evaluation Report	
Management of Evaluation *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*	**UNICEF managed**

SPOA Correspondence *(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)*		
	Health	**Yes**
	HIV/AIDS	**No**
	WASH	**No**
	Nutrition	**Yes**
	Education	**No**
	Child protection	**No**
	Social inclusion	**Yes**
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	**No**
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	**Yes**

Evaluation object	**Programme**
Evaluation type	**Summative and formative**
Evaluation strategy	**Mixed methods**

Evaluation design		Quasi-experimental
Evaluation level		Impact
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/cites, 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
The report presents a complete description of the sociopolitical context in the SoP and it discusses how the particular conditions in which Palestinians live relate to the initiative. The object of the evaluation is clearly explained, and information such as time and location, current status of the programme, primary beneficiaries and their main characteristics and needs, etc., are duly discussed. Furthermore, the report provides an explanation of the importance that the intervention has for UNICEF considering its involvement in the State of Palestine. Also, the report does a good job at presenting a recreated ToC which is clearly explained in a narrative format as well as through a graphic representation. Finally, main stakeholders and their respective roles and contributions, including those of UNICEF, are discussed in detail.		4

Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.	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 described as documenting and assessing the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the PNHV programme as well as identifying good practices and areas for improvement to inform future programming. Also, primary and secondary intended users of the evaluation and how the information will be used are clearly stated. Similarly, the report presents a thorough description of the objectives and the scope of the evaluation both in chronological and geographic terms. Additionally, elements outside of the scope are also identified. Finally, the report addresses the rationale behind the decisions made regarding the scope 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	**Not Rated**
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	**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		**Highly Satisfactory**
The report does a good job at explaining the evaluation framework used, including the use of OECD/DAC standard criteria, and the inclusion of cross-cutting principles of Human Rights, gender equality, and equity. Also, the evaluation used a mixed-methods approach involving a desk review and qualitative and quantitative data; it explains the triangulation made among different levels of evidence; and provides a rationale for the sources of information and the sampling strategy used. The evaluation presents key evaluation questions and a detailed evaluation matrix with specific evaluation questions is presented in annex 2. The report also presents the limitations faced by the evaluation and provides a mitigation strategy in each case. Finally, the evaluation does a good job at discussing the obligations of the evaluators and the corresponding ethical safeguards for participants.		**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%)		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 does a good job at presenting findings that follow the evaluation framework, respond to key evaluation questions, and are based on robust evidence. Furthermore, the evaluation addresses both positive and negative findings which are supported by several lines of evidence and a discussion is provided for causal factors that explain positive findings and challenges. The evaluation report makes reference to the initiative's M&E system and provides recommendations on the way this system could be improved in future programming. Finally, the evaluation does a good job at discussing in detail the occurrence of both unintended positive and negative effects and their 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
••••		
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 present relevant information on the most important findings and they provide further insight and a deeper analysis of the evidence presented, including a description of the challenges that may arise in future programming. Also, lessons learned are correctly identified and clearly stated.		**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**
The report presents recommendations that stem logically from the findings and conclusions. Recommendations are clearly stated and they clearly identify the target stakeholders in each case. Finally, the report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations and the way key stakeholders participated in this process (i.e. Steering Committee, regular consultations, stakeholder engagement in the reconstruction of the Theory of Change, etc.).		**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 presents the information in a clear fashion, with numbered sections and subsections and following the standard and logical order for an evaluation report, i.e. context is followed by the purpose and scope of the evaluation, which is then followed by findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. Both the opening pages and the annexes include all necessary elements in order to quickly grasp the most important information on the evaluation and complement the information in the core of the report. On the other hand, the report presents some typos and minor formatting mistakes.	📊 3

Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
The structure of the report observes good practices. On the other hand, it is recommended that the entire report be edited for typos and minor formatting mistakes.	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	**Satisfactorily integrated 2 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.	**Satisfactory**
	The evaluation does a good job at explicitly discussing the extent to which the initiative adopted a human-rights-based approach to programming, as well as at including gender equality and equity as cross-cutting issues in the evaluation. The report also refers to male involvement as being an essential part of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and provides a discussion around the best ways to include them in future initiatives. Furthermore, the report explains that special efforts were made in order to reach the most vulnerable mothers and neonates in Gaza. Similarly, the level of stakeholder involvement in the Steering committee as well as in the different stages of the evaluation is also addressed. Finally, the evaluation does a good job at mainstreaming GEEW throughout the evaluation.	**3**
	Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings	
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	**Specific evaluation questions explicitly integrate a GEEW perspective in the design of the evaluation. However, no specific criterion on gender equality was included in the evaluation.**	
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	**The evaluation uses a gender-responsive and equity-focused approach and the methodology addresses in detail the specific efforts made in order to include the voices of the most vulnerable women as well as those of men.**	

UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The evaluation's findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations reflect a consistent gender analysis.	
Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
The evaluation does in general a good job at addressing the extent to which gender equality, human rights, and equity were included in the design of the intervention. Also, the evaluation shows a good understanding of the importance of gender equality for UNICEF. However, it may add value to the evaluation to include gender equality and equity as a stand-alone criterion in order to fully reflect the importance that these principles represent.		0.15

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		89%
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	**Mostly**
	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 is thorough and provides a good understanding of the intervention. The executive summary also duly explains the methodology, main findings, and conclusions of the evaluation. All of the information included in the executive summary is developed in further detail in the core of the report. On the other hand, the executive summary is slightly long (8 pages).		**3**
Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
It is recommended that the executive summary be further synthetized to 4-5 pages in order to effectively and readily inform decision-makers about the intervention and the main elements of the evaluation.		0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)		
• • • •	**Highly Satisfactory**	**3.75**
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 observes good practices and can adequately inform end users about the PNHV programme in Gaza. It is based on a strong methodology and presents grounded findings, analytical conclusions and actionable recommendations. The report provides a particularly clear and thorough explanation of the evaluation process and the way stakeholders were involved in all stages of the evaluation.		