

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: November, 2020

Evaluación Formativa del Programa Amor para los más Chiquitos MINSA (2015-2019)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		89%	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		Evaluación Formativa del Programa Amor para los más Chiquitos MINSA (2015-2019)	
Report sequence number		Nicaragua/62/2020/16991	
Region		LACR	
Year of report		2020	
Office		Nicaragua	
Coverage (countries)		Nicaragua	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		February 21, 2021	
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)		No	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		No	
Evaluation object		Country Programme	
Evaluation type		Formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Non-experimental	
Evaluation level		Impact	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		Not specified	
EQA Summary:			
<p>El objeto de la evaluación formativa es el Programa Amor para Los Más Chiquitos (PAMOR), un programa de primera infancia implementado por tres diferentes instancias del gobierno de Nicaragua. El propósito es identificar el efecto de las intervenciones del Programa entre 2015 y 2019, cubriendo todos los departamentos y regiones en los que se ha desarrollado. La evaluación se basa en métodos mixtos, guiado por los criterios de pertinencia, coherencia, eficacia, eficiencia, sostenibilidad y dos criterios transversales de enfoque de derechos humanos y de género. La metodología a través de una encuesta y fuentes primarias y secundarias (incluyendo entrevistas individuales y grupales, grupos conversatorios y encuestas). Los hallazgos reflejan la evidencia de análisis de los diferentes métodos y fuente de información. Aunque la estructura del reporte sigue la matriz de evaluación (que no es parte del reporte, como el resto de los anexos faltantes), no es fácil la lectura debido a las deficiencias en apoyos visuales y la selección de subtítulos que se pierden. Las recomendaciones, sin embargo, son una gran guía para la audiencia primaria de la evaluación y están dirigidos a diversas instituciones, lo que las hace accionables.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<p>La evaluación tiene varias debilidades. El reporte tiene constantes faltas de puntuación y ortografía, y en ocasiones parece que el informe inicial no fue actualizado pues se habla de lo que se va a llevar a cabo y no de lo que se realizó en el contexto del proceso de evaluación, por lo que hace pesada su lectura. Adicionalmente el apoyo visual no es adecuado, algunas tablas cubren el texto. Para más orientación sobre el fortalecimiento de los procesos e informes de evaluación se recomienda revisar el Manual de GEROS y en las Normas de presentación de informes adaptadas de UNICEF (2017).</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	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).	Yes	El reporte presenta un resumen ejecutivo completo y útil para la audiencia.
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	Contiene los elementos necesarios.
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	El reporte incluye la información suficiente y necesaria.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	71%	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.	Partially	El objeto de la evaluación de la Política nacional de La Primera infancia "Amor por los más chiquitos y las más chiquitas es claro. No se incluyen costos o presupuestos de la intervención.
	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	Se describe con claridad la población objetivo de la intervención contempla un universo total de 946.912 niñas y niños nicaragüenses (100%) menores de seis años.
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	El contexto de la evaluación es amplia considerando el alcance de la intervención. Adicionalmente se incluye el contexto de América Latina.
	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	No se hace mención de los ODS.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Se describen las necesidades y situación de los niños y niñas que son considerados los beneficiarios de PAMOR.
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	Se identifican a las instituciones que están a cargo de la intervención: cada Ministerio (Ministerio de la Familia, el Ministerio de Salud (MINSA) y el Ministerio de Educación (MINED)
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Se menciona de manera general los modelos que cada ministerio tiene, pero no se especifica su contribución, ni la de UNICEF fuera de que apoya el funcionamiento en 84 municipios.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		83%	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.	Partially	Se define en términos generales el propósito de la evaluación: tener evidencia de los cambios producidos a través de PAMOR y que sirva para el diseño de nuevos programas. Se incluye a los usuarios directos y secundarios de la evaluación.
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	El objetivo de la evaluación formativa es claro y completo.
	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	El alcance de la evaluación se describe de forma completa respecto a dimensión geográfica, sectorial y temporal.
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	Se describen con claridad los resultados esperados de la intervención aunque la teoría del programa que se incluye en la sección de hallazgos es clara. Esta se ha generado como parte de la evaluación.
	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).	Partially	La teoría del cambio no identifica de manera clara la causalidad entre los productos y los efectos.
	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	Aunque se encuentra hasta la sección de hallazgos, bajo el criterio de pertinencia, la TdC so Teoría de Programa se ha elaborado por el equipo.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		85%	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	Las preguntas, subpreguntas están en la tabla 2 con base en los criterios de evaluación y nivel de análisis.
	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	La matriz de evaluación en el Anexo 2 incluye formación de juicio, indicadores, herramientas de recolección y actores.

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	El diseño de la evaluación, con métodos mixtos es relevante y adecuada considerando el propósito de la evaluación y el alcance.
	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	La fuente de la información documental y la recolectada es adecuada para la intervención.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	El diseño muestral se describe de forma general. Lo mismo que en el Anexo 5 donde se describe en detalle el muestreo.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	Los métodos de análisis se describen de manera superficial algunos de las técnicas utilizadas, en particular para la recolección de fuentes primarias como entrevistas individuales y grupales.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	La metodología utilizada da pie para desarrollar relaciones causales entre las actividades y los resultados esperados, con base en la teoría del cambio.
	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	Se incluyen las limitaciones de la evaluación, en particular covid19, y los dos huracanes que se tuvieron en Nicaragua durante el proceso de evaluación. Se incluyen también las estrategias de mitigación que se tomaron.
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	La evaluación menciona de forma explícita imparcialidad, rendición de cuentas y conflicto de intereses, pero no credibilidad e independencia.
	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.	Partially	Se menciona en la segunda pagina del reporte las consideraciones éticas y los criterios de privacidad y confidencialidad en las reuniones y grupos focales mantenidos durante el proceso evaluativo. Pero no se describe cómo se siguieron en particular los estándares éticos de UNEG.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	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	Los hallazgos se presentan con base en las preguntas y criterios de evaluación. La evidencia en cada una de las preguntas es adecuada.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Se utiliza bajo el criterio de pertinencia la Teoría del Programa de PAMOR desarrollado por el equipo evaluador.
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	La evaluación usa evidencia creible que deriva de datos tanto de los métodos cualitativos como cuantitativos. Hay evidencia en un análisis que permite la triangulación de las fuente de datos.
	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	Los hallazgos son respaldados por la evidencia y hay un balance de los resultados positivos y negativos de la intervención.
	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	Se describen los factores causales que permites lograr el impacto- o la falta de- en el PAMOR. Se presentan diversas teorías de implementación de cada estrategia además de la Teoría del Programa.
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.	Yes	Se incluye la evaluación de planificación de PAMOR en la que se considera el sistema de monitoreo del programa.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	100%	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).	Yes	Las conclusiones son claras y considerando que se trata de una evaluación formativa, las conclusiones se presentan de manera que ayuden a la mejora de la intervención
	l 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	Las conclusiones derivan de los hallazgos y se hace un balance de las fortalezas y las debilidades del programa.
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	Las lección aprendidas se derivan de los hallazgos y son relevantes para otros contextos además de la intervención evaluada.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	Las lecciones aprendidas aunque están resumidas en 6 puntos, describen suficiente detalle para la audiencia objetivo.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	75%	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	Las recomendaciones se alinean con el propósito de la evaluación y derivan de los resultados y las conclusiones.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	Las recomendaciones son útiles y accionables. Y se dirigen a diferentes instituciones.
	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	No se describe el proceso para el desarrollo de las recomendaciones.
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	Las recomendaciones están priorizadas, y se identifican a las instituciones a quienes se dirige cada una.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	64%	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	El reporte incluye todos los elementos necesarios.
	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	Los anexos incluyen los elementos necesarios.
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).	Partially	La estructura del reporte no es fácil de navegar. Los subtítulos y las preguntas de evaluación de las sección de hallazgos se pierden por el color y tamaño de letra.
	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	La estructura sigue los lineamientos de UNICEF.
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.	Yes	La extensión del reporte es adecuada.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	No	El reporte tiene múltiples faltas de puntuación y ortografía.
	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.	No	El apoyo visual del reporte es deficiente. En algunos casos las gráficas o figuras se enciman sobre el texto.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	95%	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	Se hace referencia a la Convención sobre los Derechos del Niño (CDN) y la Convención sobre la Eliminación de toda forma de Discriminación contra la Mujer (CEDAW son sus siglas en inglés)
	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	En el reporte se describe de manera general. Se hace referencia a un anexo que no está disponible de participantes.
	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	Se utiliza lenguaje que refleja sensibilidad sobre derechos humanos, género, y grupos vulnerables.
	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.	Yes	La evaluación hace referencia los derechos de los niños como titulares de los derechos, incluyendo también a grupos vulnerables como discapacitados.
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	La evaluación considera el criterio de género y enfoque de derechos, e incluye dos preguntas específicas en la matriz de evaluación bajo ese criterio que permite un enfoque de transversalidad de ambos temas centrado en el diseño y resultado de la intervención.

ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	Si bien la metodología es adecuada para ser capturar un enfoque de género y equidad, los participantes no se desagregan por género en el reporte.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	tanto los hallazgos que responden a los dos preguntas con enfoque de género y equidad, como las conclusiones incluyen de forma satisfactoria esas áreas. Debido a la adecuada incorporación del enfoque de género, ninguna recomendación hace referencia a ello.

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.

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

- 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?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. 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.

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