

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of the UNICEF Role as Cluster Lead (Co-Lead) Agency (CLARE II)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		71%	Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of the UNICEF Role as Cluster Lead (Co-Lead) Agency (CLARE II)		
Report sequence number	Evaluation Office/65/2022/18527		
Region	HQ		
Year of report	Jan-22		
Office	HQ		
Coverage (countries)	Global		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	March 6, 2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation</i>)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (<i>Alignment with strategic plan priorities</i>)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	Yes		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Strategy		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (<i>primary method used</i>)	Quasi-experimental		
Evaluation level	Impact		
Geographic scope	Multi-region/Global		
Primary SDG(s) covered (<i>number</i>)	N/A		
EQA Summary:	<i>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.</i>		
	Very well written report hampered by its overall formatting. Inclusion of photos and formatting of columns made the report unwieldy in places and disturbed the flow; good presentation and structure of the findings; excellent conclusions really captivating the essence of the report; recommendations were not so well presented and; lacking a gender responsive approach to the evaluation.		
Recommendations for Improvement:	<i>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.</i>		
	Formatting, although nice pictures and graphs needed to be revised across the whole of the document; overall introduction and purpose of the evaluation could have been meted out further; better representation of gender and human rights throughout the report and more emphasis in the findings of the overall performance and how it impacts on UNICEFS work; recommendations presentation and formulation needed to be improved; introduction of a section on lessons learned.		
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	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).	Partially	The executive summary was over 11 pages long, in part due to the infographics included. The executive summary was well written and really gave the good overview of the evaluation and could stand as a stand alone document. The recommendations were not as well presented, and were long, these were as they were presented also in the main text.
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.	Partially	Very little details were given on the overall methodology, purpose and objectives, there was no mention of the lessons learned which was not included in the body of the report. Nonetheless the overall findings and conclusions were very well written.
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 executive summary does give a good overview of the evaluation and does not introduce any new information.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	50%	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.	Not Rated	These were not included as it is about their role as cluster lead rather than an intervention per se

	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	The context did not really require this type of information; however, there was a relevant description of the role of the evaluation and that of UNICEF as cluster lead.
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.	Partially	The context was rather different given that this is an assessment of UNICEF's role, notwithstanding it did provide important and useful information although it does not cover all the aforementioned factors.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	None referenced.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Not Rated	This assessment was more on the performance of the UNICEF so it didn't really go into any detail about the rightsholders and/or beneficiaries.
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).	Not Rated	This was an evaluation on the overall performance of UNICEF as lead cluster.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	It had a very clear overview of the role of UNICEF.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	100%	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 overall purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined with a comprehensive overview of previous evaluations and the differences between the previous cluster and the present one.
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 report very clearly explains the overall purpose of the evaluation.
	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	This is a global evaluation, and therefore some of these particular factors are not taken into consideration. Nonetheless the report very clearly explains the overall scope why certain places were chosen and what type of evidence would be evaluated and the tools to be utilised.
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	This is not a project evaluation but of the role of the UNICEF as a lead cluster, nonetheless there is a very clear overview of the role as lead cluster both in the text and with a simple to understand infographic.
	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).	Not Rated	This report is more about the quality of leading a cluster by UNICEF rather than outputs and outcomes
	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.	Not Rated	This is not really a theory based evaluation.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	90%	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 questions and sub questions are appropriate for the type of intervention being assessed.
	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 does include indicators and the type of source of data but does not include any assumptions or the other processes from which analysis can be draw. However, the annexes does go into more details.
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 design is robust as it covers UNICEF on a global scale, and with the use of over 300 interviews as well as more than 400 full online answers they obtained a comprehensive feedback in order to carry out the evaluation.

	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 evaluation has put more emphasis on qualitative data given the nature of the evaluation itself, but it has also included quantitative data when needed and where available.
	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 report provides a clear breakdown of who and where people have been consulted, and how these different perspectives are captured. The report illustrates a diverse set of interlocutors and states what percentage of persons/institutions are spoken to, although data is not disaggregated.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There was not so much detail about the method of analysis, more information was contained in the annexes.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Not Rated	The evaluation is about performance of UNICEF although it clearly marks out how it will look into the information and draw these causal connections to their role as cluster lead.
	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 report provides a very clear overview of the limitations encountered and states how these challenges/limitations were overcome.
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).	Partially	The report references the UNEG obligations of evaluators, and while there is reference to "do not harm" principle, other principles are not cited.
	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	Yes	The report clearly defines how confidentiality was kept and explains how in both the KII and online surveys, ethical principles were maintained. No children were interviewed.
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 ensured a very broad sample of persons, given the fact that this was a global evaluation, it looked into eight country case studies, and KII and online surveys as well as focus groups to validate the findings.
SECTION E:		EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	70%	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.	Partially	The report is well written, although it does not follow the exact OECD criteria but rather deals with issues. Its difficult to really examine if this was the best way as the formatting of the report really interferes with the readership as lines are missing and the flow is sometimes cut. Notwithstanding the information provided does illustrate evidence to address the evaluation questions and each question is referred to, although it might have not been the most systematic way of doing it.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	This was not utilised.
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	The report refers to different sources of the data, although more relied on the qualitative data of so many interviews; however, this was already flagged as a limitation. This was also because not so much quantitative data was available. Quantitative data also from survey was presented, although formatting made it not so accessible for the reader.
	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 report clearly presents the evidence and ensures a balanced overview of the performance of UNICEF in the cluster.
	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	The report is well written (although formatting not conducive to always following text) but the causal factors were referred to and evidence presented.
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.	Partially	There was reference to the cluster coordination performance, although it was stated how useful this would be, not necessarily that they were using it. The conclusions did mention performance indicators and audit frameworks.
SECTION F:		EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	100%	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	The conclusions were actually very well formulated and were clear and 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 gave a very good overview of the findings and presented a well balanced concluding analysis of the strengths and limitations of the role UNICEF has in leading the cluster.
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.	Not Rated	No lessons learned were included
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Not Rated	no lessons learned were included
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	63%	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	The recommendations were presented in such a way it was difficult to follow them, as they had lots of sub headings on how to implement them, and it was too heavy on the reader, and some of the recommendations got diluted.
	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 were useful and actionable; however, as so many subheadings were included under each recommendation it was not always easy to follow the guidance, although breaking them into sections was a good idea. It was just the fact that they were broken down into around ten different sections under one key recommendation.
	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).	Partially	The evaluation report did cite that there had been a number of workshops to validate findings although this was not given to all duty bearers and rights holders. However, this would have been difficult given the overall scope of the evaluation (i.e. global)
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.	Partially	There was no prioritisation of recommendations, but each recommendations did state who was responsible for each one. The type of classification of recommendation was not clear, and some of the information got lost in so many paragraphs under one recommendation.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	43%	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	All of these were included.
	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	The annexes did include the ToR and include the evaluation matrix, as well as the methodology, questions etc. Although some of the formatting of the whole report (including the annexes) made it very hard to read some of the documents.
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).	No	The report was quite badly formatted, with sentences split between paragraphs, numbering of graphs on other pages, footnotes not aligned properly and sometimes put half way on the page, therefore having footnotes between text. While the use of infographs and photos was very nice, they were not properly aligned and this made the report cumbersome to read and some pages could not be read, as it was unclear where the other half of the sentence was.
	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 report followed key guidelines however as it was not an evaluation of a project or intervention per se, it did not include lessons learned.
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.	No	The Tor did not mention the number of pages, the report was 120 pages long, but some of this length was because of formatting issues.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	No	The report is very well written, but the alignment issues means that in some instances, lines were unfinished (or finished in another place) (the report was divided into columns so the columns did not always flow properly). This made it very hard to follow. In some instances, footnotes were clumped between the text in the middle of the page. There were some spelling mistakes and also a number of words clumped together.

	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.	Partially	While the report had some beautiful graphics and use of photos, infographics etc, the alignment on the pages was not always correct, which led to confusion, and actually meant the document was harder to read.
SECTION I:		EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	33%	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 are no references to any of these documents or the rights based framework.
	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 evaluation was more on the overall performance of UNICEF as a cluster lead rather than an intervention. However, there was mention of a reference group and a number of workshops which validated the findings.
	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 of the report was neutral and did not include any bias. There was not really any use of duty bearers of right holders 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	There was reference to some of these groups, such as gender and persons with disabilities, but not in the framework of the leading of the cluster but rather looking at the accountability framework for humanitarian coordination.
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)	1	
	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	There were no direct questions regarding gender and or human rights, and none of the data was disaggregated.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	There was no real reference to any type of gender responsive methodology. The evaluators did use a mixed method approach and endeavoured to interview a diverse set of stakeholders.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Not at all integrated	The report did not consider gender in any part of the findings, conclusions and recommendations, while it was not an evaluation of an intervention, it could have referred to female leadership, the impact the lead of the cluster had on women etc.

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>