

EQA for Evaluation of the Gender-Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS)



Title of Evaluation Report: Evaluation of the Gender-Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS)

Overall Assessment: The evaluation report fulfills many elements of quality assessment criteria. However, there are some structural and style issues with the report which undermine its readability, and the executive summary exceeds the recommended length. The methodology is well-explained, with limitations discussed and mitigation strategies detailed. Participatory stakeholders’ consultation is well-described. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data are detailed throughout the report, although greater detail on quantitative data would have strengthened the report. There are some issues with data, such as the low response rate to a key survey which undermines the representativeness of the sample. Findings are mostly supported by evidence, and assumptions are clearly described. However, some findings are process-orientated, which has resulted in a lower rating for this criterion. Conclusions lead to targeted and operationally-feasible recommendations, albeit focused more on operational rather than strategic issues.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i> Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable) • Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used. 	<p>Poor</p> <p>The report contains most of the required sections, including a description of acronyms used, an executive summary, introduction, methodology, findings and analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. The minimum requirements for the annexes are also met as the report includes the ToRs, bibliography, a list of interviewees, and the methodological instruments used.</p> <p>However, the report does not contain a section dedicated to explaining the context or the transferable lessons learned. A section entitled ‘Status of GBVIMS Implementation’ could be argued to serve as the context section, but this title is not consistent with the requirements. Moreover, at times the clarity of reporting can be undermined by the poor quality of images included. There are also spelling and grammatical errors, though these do not significantly detract from the clarity of reporting. In addition, operational recommendations are sometimes folded into</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
	<p>the discussion of findings. For example, on page 59 the evaluation report states: “Two needs identified by the evaluation team include laminated versions of the three page classification tool and information on the consent process to be put on office walls of SPs or compiled in simple flip books, which could be accomplished at field level using existing GBVIMS materials.”</p> <p>Also, conclusions appear to be embedded in the Findings and Analysis section before the presentation of the facts of the situation thereby blurring the distinct roles each of the substantive sections should serve</p> <p>In certain annexes the authors of the report have copy-pasted over document hyperlinks rather than including the full content of the associated document.</p>			
<p>2. Executive Summary <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i> Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page. 	<p>Poor</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation is described in detail within the executive summary. However, the intended audience is not clearly specified in the report. Furthermore, the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations are not summarized; many of these elements go into a depth that is more suited to the associated sections (9 pages in total, much higher than the maximum length required by the matrix). A findings subsection is 4 ½ pages and the conclusions and recommendations are not limited to one paragraph each but rather covered at length. While quite lengthy, the substance of the section is clear and straightforward in terms of the findings with an honest approach to presentation of the findings; the way they have followed the conclusions with the pertinent recommendations makes for ease of reading and understanding the linkage.</p>			
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence:</p>	<p>Good</p> <p>The report defined the mixed-methods approach used for data collection and analysis, providing a detailed and clear description of what this entailed in practice. Constraints and limitations are also discussed with regards to methodological</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations; • Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner; • Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation; • Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided; • Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation. 	<p>choice. For example, the report explains the reason why no GBV survivors were interviewed for the evaluation in detail; in this case the evaluation team had determined this unnecessary in collaboration with the GBVIMS SC and EAG in accordance with the WHO Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Researching, Documenting and Monitoring Sexual Violence in Emergencies. The report also includes a summary chart of limitations and mitigation strategies associated with the methodological choice. One limitation is that for two of the country visits, the evaluators did not have the necessary languages (French for DRC and Spanish for Colombia) to be able to conduct interviews except through interpreters.</p> <p>Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided: for example, the report provides details of involvement of stakeholders in a participatory workshop (p18) to discuss findings as well as a description of debriefing sessions held prior to the departure of the evaluation team from field visits to corroborate emerging findings, fill in knowledge gaps, cross-check information, and explore the feasibility of recommendations (p21). The method for selecting respondents/data points is also explained and a full list of respondents is included in the Annex.</p> <p>However, the report defines an excessive number of evaluation questions (16 also defined as sub-questions) which undermines the clarity of reporting and the focus of the evaluation.</p>			
<p>4. Reliability of Data <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; • Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; 	<p>Good</p> <p>The report carefully identifies the sources of qualitative and quantitative data throughout. Moreover, the credibility of primary and secondary data is established; for example, the report provides an explanation of field visits to three case study countries (Kenya, DRC, Colombia), detailing the facets of the GBVIMS roll-out these sites were intended to illustrate. The report also describes the manner in which country stakeholders assisted in the determination of sites,</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. 	<p>identification of informants, and organizing of site visit schedule. The responses to the survey of trainees has only a 43% coverage and as a result the representativeness of the sample is questionable. Those who responded found the training useful, but there is no information about those who did not respond.</p>			
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i> <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; Findings are substantiated by evidence; Findings are presented in a clear manner <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; Contextual factors are identified. Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained. 	<p>Poor</p> <p>Findings are mostly substantiated by evidence, and interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions. However, in certain cases, the language used to explain findings is unclear and unsubstantiated. For example, the report does not make the derivation or implication of the ‘tipping point’ clear (p38 and p39) and the reader is forced to extrapolate and make assumptions based on the available content.</p> <p>Findings are disorganized in parts – the authors seem to present their summarized conclusions prior to discussing their findings in each section. On the one hand, this may lead to questions regarding which came first (conclusions v. findings); on the other, this may represent a structural device on the part of the author to ‘frame’ findings in the context of subsequent conclusions.</p> <p>Moreover, the findings and analysis largely relies on qualitative data; the analysis rarely refers to specific numbers of respondents, but rather uses terms such as “a number of respondents” or “many respondents”. The quantitative data from the survey of trainees are used, but, as noted above, the representativeness of the data is not clear.</p> <p>The analysis section is also largely descriptive and process-oriented. However despite being primarily focused on the evaluation of processes, the report includes some discussion of cause and effect links between the intervention and its end results; for example, the report points to the contribution of the GBVIMS Consent Form to the effective and safe collection, storage, analysis, and sharing of</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
	GBV data by providing a reminder and procedure to include this in the data collection process. In other words, the report identifies a link between the intervention and the development of a survivor-centered approach in the data collection process (p36). The report also discusses the limitations in scope for this cause and effect link.			
6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. 	Good The report presents conclusions that are based upon the findings as presented. Conclusions do not specify their priority level but this can be inferred from the recommendations immediately following each conclusion. The multiplication of issues by the evaluation team and lack of prioritization of those issues has overridden the core issues of contribution and achievement of the intended results, focusing on continued but improved implementation premised on the assumption the GBVIMS is worth continuing. While no bias was apparent, the fact that the conclusions in the Findings and Analysis section that came before the findings suggest that there might be some collectively biased judgment on the intervention.			
7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	Good Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are presented in priority order. Within each class of recommendations, the report presents targeted and operationally-feasible recommendations addressed to specific actors such as GBVIMS SC members and EAG, regional and country offices, and GBV coordinators/program managers. These recommendations take account stakeholder consultations. The connection of the recommendations to the conclusions which they relate makes for ease of transition and understanding the logic. However by following this (good) practice, they also follow the emphasis on operational consideration at the expense of the overall strategic considerations at the policy level.			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>8. Meeting Needs To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report). In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.</p>	<p>Good The ToR is annexed to the report and conforms with quality standards. The report notes that the theory of change has been refined (p16). Table 1 in the ToR Annex provides a helpful point of reference which is an operational end result but one which does not coincide with the purpose of the proposed evaluation on page 5 of the ToR which is a policy set of considerations deal with inter-agency coordination, programming, fundraising, etc). The higher level result (“impact”) the latter but is not explicitly dealt with in Findings, Conclusions or Recommendations. Table 2 in the ToR details the evaluation framework; included in this is the requirement that the evaluation tracks cause and effect links, and notably determines whether the intervention provides “comprehensive and multi-sectoral services effectively delivered to survivors”. The content of the report does not adequately address this need.</p>			

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)			2	
2. Executive summary (2)			2	
3. Design and methodology (5)		5		
4. Reliability of data (5)		5		
5. Findings and analysis (50)			50	
6. Conclusions (12)		12		
7. Recommendations (12)		12		
8. Meeting needs (12)		12		
TOTAL		46	54	

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if “Finding and Analysis” has been assessed as “good”, please enter the number 50 into the “Good” column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Poor