

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: November, 2020

Summative Evaluation: Building Resilience for nutritional security in the Gambia through Social Transfers (BRST) 2016 -2019

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		91%	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		Summative Evaluation: Building Resilience for nutritional security in the Gambia through	
Report sequence number		Gambia/61/2019/16370	
Region		WCAR	
Year of report		2020	
Office		Unicef Gambia CO	
Coverage (countries)		The Gambia	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		February 10, 2021	
Name of review firm		DeftEdge	
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		Project	
Evaluation type		Summative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Theory-based	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		Not specified	
EQA Summary:			
<p>This is an end of project summative evaluation of the Gambian project aimed at contributing to maternal and child health and nutrition by reducing acute malnutrition levels among children under two years of age. The BRST project combined unconditional cash transfer for food and nutrition security and improved nutritional and caring practices through a nutritional education component, which is to serve as an important step towards setting up a broader framework within the country. The evaluation is very thorough, evidence-based and well presented. Managed by Unicef, the evaluation meets Unicef standards, OECD evaluation criteria are used and UNEG standards are met. The evaluation report is longer than the provided guidance with the executive summary – a good standalone document – exceeding (at 8 pages) the prescribed length and the body of the evaluation text exceeding (at 85 pages) the 50 page limit established in the Terms of Reference. The overall context of the project itself as well as of the evaluation is well covered. The report is very clearly written and presented, with the Findings section particularly well done. Lessons learned are provided “to design and implement nutrition and health programmes in combination with cash transfers” in the future. The Conclusions section highlights key conclusions by the evaluation criteria. Overall, the main result is that “the general well-being of the families and children supported by BRST has improved considerably”. Strategic and operational recommendations are directed to key intended primary users for future programs and policy discussions around social protection in the Gambia. Gender equity and human rights are well considered.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<p>Three recommendations stand out: (1) adhere to the guidance provided regarding length of the executive summary and the body of the text. (2) Explicitly address the key indicator – “the indicator for the achievement of this objective was a 10% reduction in the prevalence of acute malnutrition in children under two years of age, – explaining why it was not used as the “bottom line” for judging the project's success. (3) Consider the extent to which programmes are disability inclusive.</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
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	While the executive summary is a well-written stand-alone document, it is 8 pages long, exceeding the 5 page standard.
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	It includes all the necessary elements, including lessons learned.
iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from the rest of the report.	Yes	It covers the intervention and evaluation results, and does not introduce new information from the rest of the report.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	79%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
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.	Yes	There is a very extensive and thorough description of the intervention.
	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).	Partially	There is a detailed description of the duty bearers at the national, regional, and facility level but there is less detail on the specifics of the rightsholders/beneficiaries.
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	The context is carefully described, including the status of maternal and child health and nutrition.
	iii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	There are no references to SDGs.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a good description of the rightsholders' needs, including the need to reduce acute malnutrition, and improve nutritional practices.
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	The description of participating stakeholders at the national, regional and facility levels are carefully laid out.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The roles of key stakeholders are noted.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
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.
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 objectives, based on the Terms of Reference (Annex 2), are clear and complete.
	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	A clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation is presented within the section on Evaluation Scope and reflects the Terms of Reference in Annex 2.
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 intended results are based on a theory of change and the evaluation is intended to assess the part of the results chain that affects the beneficiary population.
	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	The relationship between activities, outputs and outcomes is established in a theory of change flow chart and explained in narrative text.
	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 theory of changes was revised by the evaluation team.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
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	These are appropriate.
	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 4, is complete.
Question 9.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		

	i Evaluation design and set of methods is relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	There is a solid mix of data collection methods, starting with document review and including interviews, focus group discussions, community meetings, observations and a household survey.
	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.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Key informants were identified through purposive sampling based on information provided by the Unicef Gambia Office. The evaluation also used a non-randomized comparison group of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis, including a "A Cross-cutting Approach for the Evaluation" in Annex 5, were described.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology is designed to draw causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes, based in part of the above cross-cutting approach.
	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	There is a section describing the limitations and the constraints and how these were dealt with.
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 obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).	Yes	There is a section on "Ethical Considerations" that deals with all five obligations.
	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	The ethical safeguards are described.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	92%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 11.	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 of the evaluation questions and sub-questions are systematically addressed with sufficient levels of evidence.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The results framework was the basis for the evaluation findings under each of the respective criteria.
Question 12.	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	There is credible use of both qualitative and quantitative sources. Output as well as outcome data relevant to the evaluation framework is presented and triangulation of data is evident through the use of multiple data sources.
	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	The findings, both positive and negative, are carefully based on the evidence, drawn from the evaluation framework by the evaluators.
	iii 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	The causal factors, both internal and external, are clear, based on the extensive data collection, and carefully done.
Question 13.	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 if required in ToR) to support decision-making.	Partially	The evaluation only obliquely assessed the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system by stating "indicators used to monitor results are of variable quality" and that there "are significant variations in the way" data are tracked. The recommendations include one to "reinforce the monitoring system with proper monitoring tools".
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	88%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 14.	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	For the most part conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose of the evaluation, with the exception that the evaluation does not address explicitly whether the project achieved its overall objective of "a 10% reduction in the prevalence of actual malnutrition in children under two years of age."
	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 key conclusions are presented by each of the evaluation criteria and are derived from the findings.
Question 15.	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	The lessons learned stem logically from the findings and have a wider applicability beyond the evaluation.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The five lessons learned are clear and concise and are relevant to those dealing with similar projects elsewhere.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 16.	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 evaluators note the project is completed and addressed recommendations that are directed to similar policies and interventions going forward.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations address the problems that were identified and specify the intended users.
	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	The evaluation notes that recommendations were validated during a workshop with key stakeholders.
Question 17.	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	The recommendations are presented in a chart form for each target group and prioritised. They are further classified as strategic and operational recommendations.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	86%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 18.	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	All the required information is provided.
	ii Annexes include, if not in report body: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework, 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, results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	Yes	All of the required annexes are present.
Question 19.	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 structured.
	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 evaluation report is in accordance with Unicef standards.
Question 20.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	No	The terms of Reference specified a maximum length of 50 pages (without the executive summary and annexes), but the total was 82 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 well written, easy to understand and without errors.
	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 are numerous visual aids used that help explain context and results.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	81%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 21.	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, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	There are references to both the CRC and CEDAW. In addition, the evaluation deploys a "cross-cutting approach for the evaluation that emphasizes a "equity-based and human-rights approach".
	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	The description of the duty-bearers in the evaluation and its review are noted as a reference group and as a validation workshop.
	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 inclusive but rights-based terminology is not used.
	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 uses and explains (Annex 5) a "Conceptual Framework for Equity-based approach" which includes human rights as they pertain to children. However, disability issues are not referenced.
Question 22.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)	8	
	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	GEEW is included in the objectives. A specific sub-set of questions on gender, equity and human rights was a core element of the evaluation questions and analysis.

ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	A mixed methods approach is used and ethical considerations are noted, in line with a gender-responsive approach. There is also careful gender disaggregation of KII and FGC participants. However, there could be more specific mention of how the evaluation process was gender responsive, particularly in regards to data collection in vulnerable communities.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	Issues of gender are addressed in multiple places in the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
<p>SWAP Rating Guidance</p>			
<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>			