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Evaluation Function-Key Performance Indicators

- The 2017 annual report covers how evaluation accountabilities were discharged in accordance with the evaluation policy and the plan for global evaluations

- 6 indicators are analysed:
  - Geographical coverage of evaluations
  - Evaluations submitted
  - Evaluation spending
  - Thematic distribution of evaluations
    - Types of evaluations conducted
  - Quality of evaluations
  - Use of evaluations:
    - Submission of management responses;
    - Implementation of management response actions;
Overview: Trends in selected Key Performance Indicators, 2014-2017

Geographical Coverage:
- 2014: 74%
- 2015: 76%
- 2016: 79%
- 2017: 87%

Unsatisfactory Eval:
- 2014: 3%
- 2015: 3%
- 2016: 1%
- 2017: 0%

Management Resp.:
- 2014: 79%
- 2015: 50%
- 2016: 95%
- 2017: 97%
Trends in the Geographical Coverage of Evaluations, 2010–2017, all regions

- **2010-2012**: 78% evaluated, 22% not evaluated
- **2011-2013**: 76% evaluated, 24% not evaluated
- **2012-2014**: 74% evaluated, 26% not evaluated
- **2013-2015**: 76% evaluated, 24% not evaluated
- **2014-2016**: 79% evaluated, 21% not evaluated
- **2015-2017**: 87% evaluated, 13% not evaluated

- **Office**: Offices have conducted an evaluation
- **Not Office**: Offices have not conducted an evaluation
## Trend in Geographical Coverage of Evaluations by region, 2013-2017 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EAPR</th>
<th>ECAR</th>
<th>ESAR</th>
<th>LACR</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>ROSA</th>
<th>WCAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trend in evaluation submissions, 2012-2017

Number of Evaluations Submitted

- 2012: 103
- 2013: 100
- 2014: 80
- 2015: 91
- 2016: 101
- 2017: 96
Trend in the use of evaluation budget, 2014–2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child survival and development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sector-specific evaluations</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other evaluations (cross-cutting, organizational performance)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trend in quality of evaluations, 2009–2017: satisfactory and highly-satisfactory ratings (%)
### Evaluation focus and quality, 2016 (Number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Use: Management Response Submission

- Management response is a key feature of the evaluation cycle.
- Executive Board has urged UNICEF to prioritize the timely delivery of management responses and to improve the rate of implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations.
- UNICEF was also requested to provide a formal management response with each evaluation report setting out actions and a timetable for implementation.
- UNICEF has acted to ensure that all evaluation reports uploaded to the Evaluation and Research Database are accompanied by a formal management response.
- Management response have been submitted for 97% of evaluations done in 2016.
Evaluation use: Implementation of Management Response Actions
Trends in the implementation of evaluation management responses, 2014–2017 (%)
Corporate Evaluations: Presented to the Executive Board

- DAC-UNEG peer review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF
- Evaluation of the UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme
Corporate Evaluations: Finalized or Initiated in 2017

- Evaluation of the H4+ Joint Programme (the joint initiative of six United Nations agencies for technical support of the Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s and Adolescents’ Health (presented at FRS 2018 of the Executive Board)

- Towards improved emergency responses: synthesis of UNICEF evaluations of humanitarian action 2010-2016 (presented at FRS 2018)

- Evaluation of UNICEF strategies and programmes to reduce stunting in children under 5 years of age (to be presented at Annual Session 2018)

- Joint evaluability assessment of the UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage (completed, management response under preparation)

- Evaluation of the Out-of-School Children Initiative (completed, management response under preparation)
Corporate Evaluations: Finalized or Initiated in 2017

- Impact evaluation of early childhood development kits in Senegal (ongoing)
- Evaluation of the coverage and quality of the UNICEF response in complex humanitarian situations (ongoing)
- Strengthening child protection systems: evaluation of UNICEF strategies and programme performance (ongoing)
- Evaluation of the UNICEF contribution to health systems strengthening (ongoing)
- Evaluation of the UNICEF Gender Action Plan (literature review only in 2017; full evaluation to start in 2018)
Assessment of the Evaluation Function

- DAC-UNEG peer review identified good practices and opportunities for strengthening the function

- UNICEF rated as “close to satisfactory” on utility and “short of satisfactory” on independence and credibility

- Implementation of the peer review recommendations is already underway

- Evaluation Function will be further strengthened by:
  - Increasing capacity at the decentralized level
  - Improvement of organizational learning through use of evaluation findings and recommendations
  - Acceleration of NECD through expansion of partnerships with other UN entities
  - Increasing timeliness of evaluations for greater usefulness
Conclusion

▪ Peer review provided valuable inputs for strengthening the evaluation function
▪ Improved governance with the expansion of the Audit Advisory Committee
▪ Continued engagement through UNEG on the Secretary-General’s proposals to strengthen system-wide evaluation
▪ Improvement in geographical coverage, submission and implementation of management responses
▪ Need to:
  ▪ Increase evaluation submissions and spending at all levels of UNICEF
  ▪ Improve timely generation of evaluation evidence
  ▪ Increased focus on generating evidence on what is working in humanitarian situations
▪ Revision of the evaluation policy to address among others all of the above
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