

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

EU Justice and Legal Empowerment Programme in Vietnam (EU JULE) Mid-term evaluation

REPORT RATING SUMMARY

Overall Rating	67%	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	EU Justice and Legal Empowerment Programme in Vietnam (EU JULE) Mid-term evaluation
Report sequence number	Vietnam-60-2022-18923
Region	EAPR
Year of report	2022
Office	Vietnam
Coverage (countries)	Vietnam
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)	January 24, 2023
Name of review firm	IOD PARC

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT

Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	Jointly managed with organizations outside the UN system
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	Yes
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)	10, 16

EQA Summary: The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.

This is a moderately strong report that has its shortcomings and strengths:

SHORTCOMINGS

- The executive summary is too long and lacks important aspects such as an explanation of the programme logic.
- In the methodology, neither the sampling nor the analysis methods are well described.
- The limitations of the evaluation are not presented.
- Arguably, the most important shortcoming of the report is that a majority of findings are not supported by explicit evidence from information sources. It is explained what has been found but not on the basis of what evidence so that sometimes the findings may appear to be the evaluators' opinions.
- Finally, the conclusions are a summary of the findings and not a second level analysis explaining the strengths and weaknesses of the programme.

STRENGTHS

- The context of the programme, in general, is adequately described.
- The purpose, content and scope of the evaluation are perfectly clear.
- The evaluation questions and matrix are very well outlined.
- The sources of information are varied and well described.
- Both the logical framework and the ToC of the programme are clearly used in the elaboration of the findings.
- The recommendations are concrete and actionable although they could have been prioritised more clearly.
- The structure of the report is, for the most part, clear and easy to navigate. It is of reasonable length and well written (but not of a publishable quality).
- The incorporation of UN human rights commitments is one of the strengths of the report, although the mainstreaming of GEEW in practice could be improved.

Recommendations for Improvement: The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.

In order of importance:

- Ensure that the findings are explicitly supported by the evidence that has emerged from the analysis of the information collected. If this traceability is not apparent in the report, the findings lose legitimacy and robustness.
- There are important elements that are not in this report and that were explicitly requested in the ToR (lessons learned and constraints). It would be useful for the commissioner to cross-check this in particular at the draft stage.
- The commissioner should check that the conclusions are not just a summary of the findings (that is what the executive summary is for). This way of drafting the conclusions does not add value to the report.

SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	50%	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 contains some necessary elements (i.e. conclusions and recommendations) to be useful for decision making. However, it is considerably longer than desirable and cannot be used as a stand alone document as it lacks important elements (description of the intervention).
	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	It contains most of the desirable elements of a good executive summary but also has important gaps such as a more precise explanation of the main elements of the programme.
	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.	Partially	The summary does not include information that the body of the report does not contain but does not adequately explain the programme being evaluated. Much detail is given of the design process but not what components were designed.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			79%	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.	Yes	An adequate description is given of the geographical scope of the intervention and of the costs and contributors. The management systems are also well described. The logic of the intervention is also described in a separate chapter.
	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 good description of the duty bearers but the rightsholders are described in a very generic way. There is no explanation as to why they are described in a general way.
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 report gives a very good explanation of the economic, political and above all legal circumstances in which the programme is taking place. The latter is particularly relevant to understanding the intervention.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	There is a full section explaining the relationship of the intervention being evaluated to the relevant SDGs.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	General references are made to how the context affects different groups of rightsholders although there is no explicit analysis.
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 identifies the implementing agencies and the other duty bearers and explains the relationship among them in the framework of project management. The rightsholders are also identified in a generic way.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The contribution of the UN system is identified but without disaggregating to what extent UNICEF contributes and to what extent UNDP contributes.
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	Although not called "purpose", the report does define what the main aim of the evaluation is. Potential users are also identified but not the intended uses of the evaluation. It is also not clear why it is necessary to do the evaluation at the time it was done.
Question 6.		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	There is an exhaustive explanation of the objectives of the evaluation, which are very clear.
	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 scope of the evaluation is defined in an appropriate manner.
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 evaluators have reconstructed the ToC of the intervention which was validated during the evaluation process with different stakeholders.
	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 ToC is presented graphically and narratively and the causal relationships between the different elements are easy to infer.
	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 intervention lacked a ToC and was reconstructed by the evaluators.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)			64%	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 are focused and formulated in a coherent way and in line with the different criteria. A separate criterion has been added to assess the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues.
	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 incorporates a column of indicators for each of the criteria.
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 methods that have been used are varied, appropriate and robust. The report describes them one by one in a clear manner and reflects on the advantages and disadvantages that the evaluators have found in each of them.
	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 sources consulted are appropriate, well described and a mix of quantitative and qualitative.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The sample used consisted of 171 persons disaggregated by gender and by organisation. It seems that the sample is purposive but the report does not make this explicit.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	Several references to information analysis are made throughout the document. For example, it is mentioned that it has been an iterative process. However, there is no detailed description of how the information collected has been coded and analysed.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The sources of information are ample and the methods of data collection are sound so that one might infer that relatively robust cause-effect relationships can be established. However, as the methods of analysis are not fully defined, it is not entirely certain that the methodology will allow for the establishment of robust cause-effect relationships.
	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).	No	There is no explicit section addressing the limitations of the evaluation and the measures taken to mitigate them.
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 makes explicit reference to some (but not all) of these values.
	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 evaluation has taken appropriate ethical measures to adequately safeguard the participants in the evaluation.
Question 11.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	The evaluation or the practice cannot be considered innovative.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	67%	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 organised around evaluation questions that are clearly answered with findings that are however rarely evidence-based.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Both the results framework and the ToC are present in the formulation of a critical mass of findings.
Question 13.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		

	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Partially	Rarely do findings refer to the evidence on which they are based. Therefore, findings can often appear to be about the opinions of the evaluators. For example "the extensive numbers and levels of approval within the current governance structure are not justified and, from our point of view, prevent the expeditious generation of results".
	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	Most (but not all) of the findings are not supported by evidence from the analysis of the data collected.
	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).	Partially	Some causal factors influencing the findings are well identified and explained. Most relevantly, institutional factors of the different stakeholders.
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 M&E system is evaluated on different criteria, e.g. relevance and efficiency.
SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)		38%	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 are formulated in a straightforward and concise manner and are clearly related to both the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.
	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.	Partially	The conclusions are a summary of the findings where no second level of analysis that would give an insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the programme.
Question 16.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	No	No lessons learned have been developed in the report. Evaluation question 22 explicitly asks about this, but in response a good practice has been developed and not a lesson.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	No lessons learned in the report.
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.	Yes	The recommendations are explicitly connected to the conclusions and findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Recommendations have been formulated that are sufficiently sharp and concrete to be actionable. The users of the recommendations are identified, albeit in a very general way. In some cases directions are given for the implementation of the recommendations but not in most of them.
	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 report clearly explains how the recommendations were developed and who was involved.
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 is a classification rather than a prioritisation of recommendations, although even this is not very clear. For example, the recommendation on "Programming of any future EU-funded intervention" has been classified both as a high priority, which seems to refer to immediate implementation, and as a recommendation to be carried out in the next phase of the programme.
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		71%	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.	Partially	The first few pages include a table of contents, acronyms and tables of figures, but there is no detailed programme factsheet.
	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 included are adequate.
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).	Partially	The document is well signposted but the formatting of the headings is confusing as it is sometimes smaller than the main body of the text.
	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	In general the structure of the report is correct. The general building blocks of an evaluation are present and in an appropriate sequence. However, there are nuances that make the order and structure confusing, such as placing the description of the intervention after the methodology.
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	ToRs do not specify a specific number of pages required. The report is 44 pages excluding the executive summary and annexes which seems a reasonable length although there is no formal reference on which to base this judgement.
	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.
	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	Visual aids are used with some frequency and add value to the text, but not all of them are referenced, especially tables.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	76%	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.	Yes	These conventions are referenced in the report.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	The degree of participation of both duty bearers and rightsholders is well described. The evaluation management system is well explained as well as the role of the Evaluation Reference Group.
	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	The information is disaggregated and the language of the evaluation is thoughtful.
	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	The report is very inclusive.
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)	4	
	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.	Satisfactorily integrated	The scope of the evaluation explicitly mentions that gender mainstreaming in the programme is part of it. It has been decided to dedicate a specific criterion to investigate gender issues and other cross-cutting issues. Gender has also been mainstreamed in some of the other criteria such as relevance but not in all of them. This means that some important information has not been collected, for example if there was adequate allocation of funds for gender mainstreaming.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	In the description of the methodology, the evaluation commits itself on several occasions to promoting gender-sensitive methods of data collection and analysis. The translation of this commitment, i.e. how it has been translated into evaluation practices, is not explained. It should be noted, however, that the findings are supported by a majority of women's testimonies, although it is unclear whether this is the result of an explicit evaluation design.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	GEEW is present in the findings, conclusions and recommendations although in a very lateral way without an in-depth analysis.

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>

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?