Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation: Evaluation of WASH in Schools

Sequence No: 2017/003

Region: ROSA

Office: Afghanistan

Coverage: Afghanistan

Evaluation Type: Country Programme

Year of Report: 2017

OVERALL RATING

- Satisfactory

Implications:

- Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

Lessons for future evaluations:

- Each intervention needs to be backed by a ToC and Results Framework. This will enable focused evaluation. Gender issues should be properly integrated in evaluations. For improvement in such evaluations the evaluator is advised to see Better Evaluation, Manager’s Guide, Scope the Evaluation, Sub-Step 2, Theory of Change etc. http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/node/5280

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

- Satisfactory

The report gives a detailed description of the intervention and its context. Budget and cost details are not given. Implementation status is given (section 1.6). The programme did not have a clear logic chain, but the report states that the evaluators had to develop one (This however is not there in the report). Key stakeholders are identified and their contributions (though not in financial terms) are given (section 1.7).

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

- Highly Satisfactory

The purpose and objectives are listed and also the intended users of the results. The changes in scope due to security concerns are described in detail.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

- Satisfactory
The report (and Annex 2) contains an elaborate account of methodology adopted including sample size determination and selection. Data sources and limitations are described. Ethical safeguards taken are mentioned (section 2.5) and the tools of data collection provided for respondents' consent, except in the case of children it is not clear if parental consent was obtained. The evaluation adopted the usual criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Evaluation matrix is in Annex 3 and tools of data collection in the next Annex.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory
The findings are neatly grouped by evaluation criteria and address each of the evaluation questions. They are based on sufficient evidence gathered from various sources and synthesized. The findings mention that the monitoring is very weak. There is practically no reference to the intervention's results framework (probably there is none).

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNT (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
The conclusions and lessons learnt are based on findings and evidence.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Fair
The recommendations flow from findings and conclusions. However, there is no mention of how the recommendations are finalized. ToRs refer to a Reference Group and a pre-finalization workshop of stakeholders, but it is not clear if these procedures are followed. Also it is said that the recommendations are directed to UNICEF and Ministry of Education, but there is no specific indication against each recommendation. Also no priority is indicated.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The report is well-structured and is easy to navigate. The components are in proper order. However, certain elements are conspicuous by their absence, such as ToC, Evaluation Matrix (stated to be at Annex 3, but Annex 3 is something else), list of interviewees and site visits. The report says that QPA method is described in Annex 7, but actually it is in Annex 2. It appears all the Annexes are not included in the report and there is no correspondence between Annexes mentioned in the main text of the report and the actual annexes.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Fair
There is no evidence in the report about gender and equity considerations in selecting respondents nor to the Evaluation Management or Reference Groups mentioned in ToRs. The report states (p22 under Objectives) that while TORs mentioned that ‘the programme was being implemented through equity, human rights and gender-based approaches, ensuring equitable access to water and sanitation for all children at schools’ there is no document that described the approach and substantiated this assertion. It is also reported that there was little involvement of local stakeholders, let alone women, in the planning/implementation was not according to UNICEF’s approach to gender (Main finding on evaluation question 3 (p44). As regards SWAP requirements: a) gender and equity issues are included in evaluation scope, but no parameters were prescribed for evaluation; b) Evaluation Question 3 addresses equity and gender issues; c) data collection tools do not provide for gender data (except where the issue relates solely to girls), and no break-up of respondents by gender is provided; d) there is gender segregated analysis to a limited extent.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory
The Executive Summary is comprehensive and includes various elements of the report. However, there needs to be a balance in treating various elements. For example, findings on relevance are too elaborately reported. It would have been better to list the recommendations according to who needs to act on each.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 4 | Approaches requirements |

Recommendations for improvement

| Section A | Budgets and costs should also be given. The ToC developed by the evaluators should have been included and used in evaluation. |
|Section B | The report meets the requirements of this section satisfactorily. |
|Section C | The methodology is well described. |
|Section D | Interventions results framework and the monitoring system should be discussed in detail. There is also no cost analysis. |
|Section E | Requirements of this section are met |
|Section F | Recommendations need to be prioritized. |
|Section G | The report should include ToC (stated to have been developed), Evaluation Matrix, details of interviewees, site visits etc. Annex numbers should have been mached with the text to make it easy to navigate. |
|Section H | The evaluation report should give a break up of respondents by gender and whether there is any difference in perceptions of the two genders. Gender and equity issues are addressed but only to a limited extent. |
|Section I | Executive Summary can serve as an instrument for action. Executive summary should have a balance in providing information. Some portions are more elaborative than others. |