

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Improving the Nutritional Status of Children Under 5 in Zambezia and Nampula Provinces, Mozambique: An Impact Evaluation of PROMOVE

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	46%	Fair	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Improving the Nutritional Status of Children Under 5 in Zambezia and Nampula Provinces, Mozambique: An Impact Evaluation of PROMOVE		
Report sequence number	Republic of Mozambique/63/2024/13519		
Region	ESAR		
Year of report	2024		
Office	UNICEF Mozambique CO and Evaluation Office		
Coverage (countries)	Mozambique		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	February 12, 2024		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Quantitative		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Quasi-experimental		
Evaluation level	Impact		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	No SDGs are mentioned in the report		
EQA Summary: The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.			
<p>The evaluation report has the following strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The evaluation is a quasi-experimental rigorous impact evaluation using a difference-in-difference approach. •There is a clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention with regards to relevant policies and socio-economic and political factors, including how the implementation of the intervention relates to the context. •There is a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rightsholders of the intervention, especially regarding poverty, nutrition and environmental factors. •The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use and key intended users. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to measure causal impacts of the PROMOVE full nutrition package. •There is a clear description of the intervention's intended results that are being tested by the evaluation. •The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. There was one research question with two sub-questions: (Q) What was the impact of PROMOVE intervention on nutritional outcomes and their immediate and underlying causes in areas that received the full package as compared to areas that did not receive UNICEF support? (SubQ1) Were there any differences in measured impact in between different groups? (SubQ2) How did the different activities of the package shape outcomes? •The evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, and they are fully and clearly described. The data sources are appropriate. The evaluation applied quasi-experimental quantitative techniques to rigorously assess nutritional outcomes for children in treatment areas compared to children in comparison areas. •The methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and outcomes, including attribution (i.e., it can determine the degree to which the results are attributable to the intervention). •The findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all evaluation questions and sub questions. •The findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. <p>The evaluation report has the following weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The report contains no Executive Summary, no Evaluation Matrix, no reference to any ethical obligations or guidelines, and no lessons learned. •One weakness in the presentation of the findings is that since "children being fully breastfed" is only relevant for the up to 5-6 months olds, it looks like breastfeeding has no or even negative impact on child nutrition when it is presented and treated in a sample including all children up to 5 years. However, when calculating the effects of breastfeeding on the up to 5-6 months olds only (i.e. only for the children that breastfeeding has relevance, it is evident that breastfeeding has a large statistically significant effect. Presenting this indicator together with the other indicators in a sample including all children up to 5 it makes it look like breastfeeding has no or even negative effect on child nutrition, - which is misleading and can lead to wrong conclusions and recommendations. •No linkages are drawn to the SDGs or relevant targets and indicators that are being evaluated. SDGs are not mentioned at all in the report. •The process for developing the recommendations is not described. •There is no identification of groups of duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation. No clear prioritisation or classification of the recommendations is provided to support use. 			
Recommendations for Improvement: The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.			
<p>The report would benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An Executive Summary, an Evaluation Matrix, a clear presentation of the intervention's Theory of Change, and relevant reference to ethical obligations and guidelines. •Clear linkages to the relevant SDGs and related indicators and targets. •A description of the process of developing the recommendations including identification of the groups of duty bearers responsible for action foreach recommendation and a prioritization of the recommendations. 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	0%	Comments on Rating	
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		

	i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	No	There is no Executive Summary. There is only a one-page fact sheet called Executive Summary. This cannot serve as a standalone document useful for decision making. It is not of relevant conciseness and depth for key users.
	ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	No	The report lacks an Executive Summary. There is only a one-page fact-sheet called Executive Summary. It only presents the intervention in a couple of sentences, the methodology in one sentence and a table presenting some results. It does not include all the necessary elements of an Executive Summary.
	iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	No	The report lacks an Executive Summary. The fact sheet presented in place of an Executive Summary does not include all significant information needed to understand the intervention.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			43%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.		Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Partially	The presentation of the intervention states that "At its inception, the PROMOVE nutrition program aligned with the Government's five-year plan to reduce childhood stunting to 35% by 2020 and achieve six maternal and infant nutrition targets set by the World Health Assembly. The program, denominated "Improving the Nutrition Status of Children in Mozambique", focused on scaling up high impact nutrition and WASH interventions in seven districts across Zambézia and Nampula provinces for children aged 0-59 months, with special emphasis on the critical '1,000 days window' from conception to two years of age, which is when most stunting occurs and interventions can have the greatest impact." The program (or the evaluation) covers two provinces in Mozambique. Timelines, cost/budget and implementation status is not covered in the background section, and no proper description of the program including components is given.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) 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, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	No	There is no clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders and duty bearers by type, geographic locations and in terms of numbers reached.
Question 3.		Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention with regards to relevant policies and socio-economic and political factors, including how the implementation of the intervention relates to the context.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	No linkages are drawn to the SDGs or relevant targets and indicators that are being evaluated. SDGs are not mentioned at all in the report.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rightsholders of the intervention, especially regarding poverty, nutrition and environmental factors.
Question 4.		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	The implementing agencies and developing partners, rights holders and duty bearers are identified, but no clear linkages between them is drawn.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	No	There is no identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders, financial or otherwise.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			58%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use and key intended users. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to measure causal impacts of the PROMOVE full nutrition package across a range of household, caregiver, and child-level outcomes.
Question 6.		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i	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 (if applicable).	Yes	There is a clear description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process; i.e., to measure causal impacts of the nutrition package across a range of household, caregiver, and child level outcomes.

	ii	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, if applicable, 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).	Partially	There is some description of the scope of the evaluation (p. 9). It is stated that the aim of the evaluation is to explore the impact of the intervention package on nutritional outcomes and their immediate and underlying causes and investigating whether effects are different based on community or participant characteristics or on activities implemented. No further description of the scope is given; no outlining of what will and will not be included in the evaluation or why.
Question 7. Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?				
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a clear description of the intervention's intended results that are being tested by the evaluation.
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	No	The causal relationship between the intervention's expected outputs and outcomes is not clearly presented in the narrative nor in graphic form. There is no theory of change in the document.
	iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	No	The intervention's theory of change is not presented or assessed, and not reformulated by the evaluators. A reformulation of the intervention's ToC is presented as a recommendation (and it is the only time in the report that a ToC is mentioned).
SECTION D:		EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	59%	Comments on Rating
Question 8. Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.				
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. There was one research question with two sub-questions: What was the impact of PROMOVE intervention on nutritional outcomes and their immediate and underlying causes in areas that received the full package as compared to areas that did not receive UNICEF support? o Were there any differences in measured impact in between different groups? o How did the different activities of the package shape outcomes? No evaluation criteria were used, as the evaluation used quasi-experimental design.
	ii	In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	No	No evaluation matrix is presented in the report.
Question 9. Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?				
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, and they are fully and clearly described on pages 10-15 of the report.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources are appropriate. The evaluation applied quasi-experimental quantitative techniques to rigorously assess nutritional outcomes for children in treatment areas compared to children in comparison areas. The evaluation was conducted as a secondary analysis of primary data collected during two rounds of data collections: a baseline conducted in February-March 2019, and an endline conducted in April 2022.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy is provided and includes a description of how diverse perspectives are captured. Sample stratification was operationalized through the use of census data from 2017 and power calculations. EAs were randomly selected within districts (inside each of the two regions) and then households within the EA were included in the study based on randomisation - i.e. a list of households was drafted for each EA and surveyed households were selected randomly from the list. In case random household selection was not possible (e.g. because a list of households in the EA was not available), a systematic random sampling approach was adopted consisting in in-the-field household selection based on households' location. Finally, within each household, information on as many children under the age of 5 as possible was collected.

	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of the methods of analysis. Due to the availability of cross-sectional data from two survey rounds conducted before and after the intervention, a difference-in-difference model strengthened by propensity score matching (PSM) weighting was applied as analytical strategy. Households living in areas that received the full PROMOVE nutrition support package were compared with households living in areas not supported by UNICEF, before and after the intervention was implemented. To this difference-in-difference design, a matching strategy that compares households between treatment and control groups based on a propensity score calculated starting from key household characteristics was applied.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	This methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and outcomes, including attribution (i.e., it can determine the degree to which the results are attributable to the intervention).
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	There is a clear and complete description of the evaluation's limitations and constraints. One limitation was that since the evaluation used exclusively quantitative data from household surveys, it lacks any qualitative component to triangulate the findings with. A second limitation relates to the analytical methods adopted. While the difference-in-difference analysis is a robust quasi-experimental econometric technique, and the multiple tests conducted to validate the data confirm the quality of the results, if an experimental design would have been possible, with the same individuals being interviewed through time, this would have increased the internal validity of the evaluation.
Question 10.	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:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	No	No reference to any ethical obligations or guidelines is provided in the report.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	No	There is no description or discussion of ethical safeguards in the report.
Question 11.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	No innovation practice is used in this evaluation.
SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)		50%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	The findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all evaluation questions and sub questions. The evaluation does not apply evaluation criteria.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	No	There is no explicit use of the intervention's results framework or ToC in the formulation of the findings.
Question 13.	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.		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Partially	The evaluation uses credible forms of quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome level data as relevant. No qualitative data is collected, and hence triangulation is not possible.

	ii 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 as relevant for each question.	Partially	The findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. The findings are based on clear performance indicators. One weakness, however, is that since "children being fully breastfed" is only relevant for the up to 5-6 months old, when it is presented and treated in a sample including all children up to 5 years (like it is in this report), it looks like breastfeeding has no impact on child nutrition. However, when calculating the effects of breastfeeding on the up to 5-6 months olds only (i.e. for the only children this is relevant), it is evident that breastfeeding has a large statistically significant effect. When this indicator is presented together with the other indicators in a sample including all children up to 5 it looks like breastfeeding has no or even negative effect on child nutrition, - which is misleading and can lead to wrong conclusions and recommendations.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	Causal factors leading to achievement and non-achievement of results are clearly identified, as it is part of the evaluation design. For example, it is stated that the evaluation found an overall increase in malnutrition levels in Nampula and Zambezia spread evenly among the different posto administrativos in both UNICEF-supported and unsupported districts. Such an increase is most probably due to the frequent climate shocks, especially flooding, experienced over the evaluation period by the two provinces, and the northeast of Mozambique more in general.
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy 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) to support decision-making.	No	No assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system is done.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	50%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	While not called "Conclusions", they are clearly formulated (from page 28ff) and reflect well the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking.
	ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions are derived appropriately from the findings (by direct referral to them), and they present a candid picture of both the strengths and limitations of the intervention. It adds insight and analysis beyond the presentation of findings earlier in the report.
Question 16.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	No	No lessons were identified.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	No lessons were presented.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	38%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations align well with the evaluation purpose, they are clearly formulated and derive logically from the findings. The recommendations are presented in a table together with the underlying findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	The recommendations are for the most part useful and actionable for primary intended users and use. Some of the recommendations are only further descriptions of the findings, though, and do not have clear recommendations for actions.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	No	The process for developing the recommendations is not described.
Question 18.	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	No	There is no identification of groups of duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation. No clear prioritisation or classification of the recommendations is provided to support use.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	86%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i 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	The opening pages include the name of the evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, names and organizations of the evaluators, name of the commissioning organization, table of contents, including tables, figures and annexes and a list of acronyms. The page numbering is not clear and should be edited.

	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), 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, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Partially	The annexes include List of references and Determinants analysis. Annexes do not include the ToR, evaluation matrix, list of site visits, or data collection instruments.
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The structure of the report is relatively easy to identify and navigate (despite the errors with the page number at the beginning of the report), with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles. It lacks an executive summary.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Partially	The structure partially accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports, context purpose and methodology precede findings, which is followed by recommendations. Conclusions are provided, but they are not called conclusions. No lessons learned is provided.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The report is of a reasonable length; only 30 pages.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is easy to understand and it is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is a frequent use of visual aids with 6 tables and 10 figures. These are clearly presented, labels and referenced in the text.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	17%	Comments on Rating
Question 22.	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?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	No	There is no reference to or use of rights based frameworks such as CRC, CCC or CEDAW, or other, in the report.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	No	There is no description of the level of participation of key rights holders (other than as respondents to the surveys).
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Partially	The language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias. The terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is not used. Data is disaggregated by marginalized groups as appropriate.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	No	The evaluation does not assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights or the Leave No-one Behind principle.
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	2	
	i 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.	Not at all integrated	The evaluation does not assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results. The evaluation does not include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations. There was no standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights. There was no dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The evaluation specifies how gender issues are addressed in the methodology in a way, as mothers and care givers of children are targeted in the intervention and in the evaluation. The evaluation methodology does not employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations. It employed a quantitative approach only. The data sources and processes were not very diverse, all data are based on two surveys (baseline and endline). The evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate. Ethical standards might have been considered throughout the evaluation, but no information about this is provided in the report.

	<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p>	<p>Partially integrated</p>	<p>The evaluation has a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue. The findings include data analysis that disaggregates quantitative data. Unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not described? The evaluation report does not provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------	--

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>i 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.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>