

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of BRIDGE IPC Training Programme

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		88%	Highly Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report		Evaluation of BRIDGE IPC Training Programme	
Report sequence number		India/64/2021/16198	
Region		SAR	
Year of report		2021	
Office		UNICEF India	
Coverage (countries)		India	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		February 4, 2022	
Name of review firm		DefEdge	
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		No	
Every child has an equitable chance in life		No	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		No	
Evaluation object		Programme	
Evaluation type		Formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Theory-based	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		3	
EQA Summary:			
<p>This is a highly satisfactory Evaluation of BRIDGE IPC Training Programme in India. The goal of the evaluation was to assess: (i) The frontline workers' IPC skills; and (ii) The quality of the social mobilization plans (awareness and demand generation) and the sub-center level demand generation for routine immunization. The evaluators developed a theory of change to allow assessment of the linkages between input, activity, output, outcome, and impact. Questions and sub-questions are appropriate for the purpose of evaluation and are aligned with OECD-DAC criteria. The evaluators used mixed-methods to collect data using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews with front line workers, online self-assessments with district trainers, and remote interviews with national lead trainers, state officials, district officials and UNICEF consultants. Quantitative data was analyzed for descriptive as well as inferential statistics, and qualitative data was coded using Nvivo. The ToC is explicitly used in the formulation of the findings. There is a dedicated conclusions section focusing on linkages of findings with ToC and validation of assumptions. The lessons and recommendations could have been made more detailed, user-friendly and actionable. Gender is integrated as a criterion with two questions and also taken up in evaluation objectives, scope and theory of change. The evaluation findings have a dedicated section covering gender; similarly, gender perspectives are reflected in conclusions and recommendations.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<p>This is a highly satisfactory evaluation; however, it could be improved in the following areas: (i) Lessons and recommendations could include more details to be useful. (ii) There is a heavy dependence on acronyms in the report, making it difficult to read and comprehend. (iii) It is always a good practice to make references to relevant rights frameworks and conventions. (iv) All evaluations should assess the extent to which the interventions under review are disability inclusive, even if this aspect is not addressed in the ToR.</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		100%	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).	Yes	At 4.5 pages, the summary is reasonable in length and serves as a standalone document useful for decision-making.
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.	Yes	All required elements are included.
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.	Yes	The summary contains all information required to understand the intervention and does not offer any new material.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		93%	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	Section 1.1 provides sufficient overview of the details of the intervention. There was no cost / budget information made in numeric terms, only information on which entities were financially responsible for the different aspects of the programme. While the lack of budget information was noted, it is good practice to minimally include the total amount UNICEF contributed.

	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)	Yes	The rights holders and the duty bearers are described clearly. The proportion of persons reached through training is presented by role and by geographic areas. The immunization coverage is presented by geographic area and disaggregated by sex, caste, and urban or rural residence.
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 discussion of the context, including gender disparities and vaccine hesitancy.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	It is noted that the intervention contributes towards SDG 3, target 3.2.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The status and needs of the rightsholders are clearly described.
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).	Yes	It is clear who the rightsholders and the duty bearers are.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The specific contributions of key stakeholders are described clearly. The cost for training for frontline workers was covered by government, while UNICEF provided all the training tools and job aides and funded training of trainers.
SECTION C:		EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	92%	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.	Partially	The purpose of the evaluation is described. The goal of evaluating the frontline workers' BRIDGE training was to assess: (i) The frontline workers' IPC skills; and (ii) The quality of the social mobilization plans (awareness and demand generation) and the sub-center level demand generation for routine immunization. The findings are intended to be used to strengthen existing Inter-personal communication (IPC) programmes. As such, it appears the evaluation's primary purpose is learning, however this is not clearly explained. Why it was needed at this point in time is also not clearly explained.
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	The 6 specific objectives of the evaluation are clearly described on page 9.
	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).	Yes	The report describes the thematic, geographic, and chronological scope of the evaluation. The reasons for selecting the geographic scope are well-explained.
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	The intervention's intended results are clearly presented in the ToC on page 13.
	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).	Yes	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes are clearly presented in the ToC (page 13).
	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.	Yes	The evaluators developed a theory of change to allow assessment of the linkages between input, activity, output, outcome, and impact. A theory of change was not previously available.
SECTION D:		EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	95%	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? <i>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>		
	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 the purpose of evaluation and follow the OECD-DAC criteria.
	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.	Yes	The evaluation matrix provided in Annex IX includes evaluation objectives/ criteria, indicators, evaluation questions/ area of inquiry, information sources, and data collection method.
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 methods are sufficiently robust for fulfilling the evaluation objectives. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach through surveys/structured interviews and in-depth interviews.
	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 evaluators used mixed-methods to collect data using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews with front line workers, online self-assessments with district trainers, and remote interviews with national lead trainers, state officials, district officials and UNICEF consultants
	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 carefully described on page 14.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis are clearly described. Quantitative data was analyzed for descriptive as well as inferential statistics. Whereas qualitative data was coded using Nvivo.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The evaluators used an appropriate methodology for drawing causal connections. There is a dedicated section provided which focuses on unpacking the findings against the theory of change on page 49.
	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).	Yes	The limitations and mitigation measures are clearly described under section 2.9.
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).	Yes	The UNEG obligations of evaluators are described on page 21.
	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.	Yes	Ethical considerations including their application are described under section 2.10.
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.	Partially	The evaluation adopted a standard mixed methods approach to collect qualitative as well as quantitative data. However, the evaluation team managed to reach an extensive number of training participants through surveys/structured interviews (over 1300) using both computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATIs) and computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) technologies, with the latter being distributed via both email and WhatsApp. For this reason, a partial was given.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	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	All questions and sub-questions are addressed using adequate evidence.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The ToC is explicitly used in the formulation of the findings, especially in section 4.1.
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.	Yes	Both qualitative and quantitative data are presented to back findings. Triangulation is evident.
	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.	Yes	Findings are well supported and use indicators from the evaluation matrix.
	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 of results are described by the evaluators.
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.	Yes	The monitoring system of the intervention is thoroughly assessed and shortcomings found are carried through to recommendations.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	75%	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).	Partially	Conclusions are clearly formulated and sufficiently forward looking. However, they are not clearly structured around the evaluation criteria, which would have made them easier to follow. They are instead organized around assumptions and thematic areas uncovered within the findings.
	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	Conclusions are based on findings and present both strengths and weaknesses of the intervention.
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.	Yes	Lessons are based on findings and provide generalized insights on effective implementation of cascaded trainings.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons included are brief and could have elaborated further to make them more useful for their intended audience.
SECTION G:		RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	75%	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.	Partially	Recommendations are presented by criteria and are useful for the purpose of evaluation. Corresponding findings on which they are based are also provided. However, they are not always clearly formulated and sometimes read like lessons. The majority of the recommendations section recounts the specific findings which they are based on.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Recommendations are actionable in that they add priority levels, however they are brief and some have insufficient levels of guidance or consideration of the implications for their intended audience.
	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).	Yes	It is noted under the recommendations section that the findings of the evaluation were presented to UNICEF, the ERG members and Ministry of Health and Family Welfare representatives.
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.	Yes	Recommendations are prioritized and directed towards intended users.
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 all required elements.
	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.	Yes	Annexes are complete.
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 report is well formatted and easy to follow.
	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.	Yes	The report follows UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.
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	At 59 pages, the report is reasonable in length.
	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	No	There is too frequent use of acronyms in the report, making it difficult to follow and comprehend.
	iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is frequent use of many well chosen visual aids including charts, graphics, tables, and maps.
SECTION I:		EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	69%	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, CCCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	No	These frameworks are not mentioned.
	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).	Yes	Frontline workers and district trainers participated in Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATIs), and online self-assessment. Whereas national lead trainers, UNICEF staff, and medical officers participated in in-depth interviews.
	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).	Yes	Evaluators show differential results and make use of rights-based terminology.

	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.	Partially	The evaluation assesses the extent to which the intervention covered vulnerable groups, however evaluators note that they did not cover the aspect of disability as it was beyond the scope of the ToR. In the context of child vaccinations and remote cascade trainings, disability remains an important concern for inclusive access which should not be outside of the scope of any evaluation.
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)	7	
	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.	Fully integrated	Gender is integrated as a criteria with two questions and also taken up in the evaluation objectives and scope. Gender and equity were also mainstreamed into the developed theory of change, ensuring GEEW-related data would be collected in this theory-based evaluation.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	It is noted that methodology follows UNEG norms and standards, including guidance on human rights and gender equality in evaluation. A sex disaggregated list of evaluation participants is provided. However, the report could have been more explicit about gender-responsive practices used during data collection.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Evaluation findings have a dedicated section covering gender. Similarly, gender perspectives are also reflected in the conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations related to gender and equity could have been more expansive and clear, as with all of the recommendations.

SWAP Rating Guidance

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.

- 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?
- Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- Is there a 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.

- 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?
- Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

- 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?
- 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?
- Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- 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?