UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White	The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable	
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding/ Very Confident to Act	Good/ Confident to Act	Almost satisfactory / Almost Confident to Act	Unsatisfactory/ Not Confident to Act		The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System	UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System	UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards

	Response			
Title of the Evaluation Report	An Assessment of Armenia's Child friendly School Pilot Projects and CFS Standards for UNICEF Armenia			
Report sequence number	2009/007	Date of Review	22/11/2010	Year of the Evaluation Report	2009
Region	Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO	Country(ies)	Armenia
Type of Report	Evaluation	TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC		

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographical *(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)*	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country	
Management *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.	
Purpose *(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'etre)*	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes	
Result *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme	
MTSP Correspondence *(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)*	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (2. Basic education & gender equality)	
Level of Independence *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.	
Timing / Stage	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme	

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

Question	cc	Remarks	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	Aspects of the object of the evaluation are provided. Reference is made to the Child-Friendly School Pilot (CFS) Projects and description is provided of how the schools concerned were selected in a competitive process. Also generic principles of Child Friendly Schools are provided. What is lacking is description of the specific project activities.	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.	
2 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Yes	Elements of the results chain of the project are provided at different locations in the text.		
3 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Outstanding	Context is clearly explained in terms of Education in Armenia, as well as in the wider global context and the emergency of the CFS concept. This is related to the CFS project to be evaluated.		
4 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Outstanding	There is a separate section in which key stakeholders and their roles are made clear. What is missing is any reference to the kind of relative contributions made by each of these stakeholders. Though UNICEF's role is included, contributions made are not specified.	The Child Friendly School Pilot project, which is the object of the evaluation is described in particular with reference to the CFS principles. Some of the history of the project is also provided including how schools concerned were selected in a competitive process. Context in which the project is implemented is well presented and the roles of the various stakeholders in development of education in Armenia are provided, with linkages to the project to be evaluated.	In addition to identifying stakeholders and describing their role, it is useful to provide details on their contribution to the development issue concerned so that the reader gets an idea of the relative contribution of UNICEF compared to the contributions of other stakeholders.
5 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Almost			
6 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Almost			
7 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Almost Almost	Implementation status is not made explicit, though in the introduction the purpose is clearly beyond improvement of the present projects so presumable this concerns a summative evaluation towards the end of the pilot project.		
8 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes	Description of context and stakeholders' roles does enhance the understanding of the findings.		
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*				

Confident to Act

The Child Friendly School Pilot project, which is the object of the evaluation is provided in particular in terms of CFS principles and aspects of the results framework included. The context in which the project is implemented as well as the roles of the various stakeholders in development of education in Armenia are well described, with linkages to the project to be evaluated.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is provided but in the introduction there is no clear attention under a separate heading to the objectives and scope of the evaluation, i.e. What the evaluation is meant to cover. There is scattered information available, most in particular on p 7 but this is not made explicit. In the findings section of the report though the five DAC Evaluation criteria are mentioned and used.	The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Almost			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes			
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	DAC Evaluation criteria are used though no reference to them is made in the introduction. The reader only realizes the use of these criteria when reading the findings (and reviewing the Table of Contents).	**Confident to Act** — Purpose of the evaluation is made clear in the introductory part of the report. Objectives and scope of the evaluation are included and use if made of the DAC Evaluation criteria. Objectives are only specified at the start of the findings, rather than in the introductory part of the report.	The objectives and scope of the evaluation need to be included in the introductory part of the evaluation report, in order to provide a clear picture to the reader of what the evaluation is meant to address. This is in line with the UNICEF adapted UNEG Evaluation report standards.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Yes	In the findings the DAC criteria are referred to as part of the TOR of the evaluation. There is no reference to the DAC Criteria in the introductory part of the report.		
14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender	Yes	There is reference to the CRC as the basis for the CFS approach in the introduction to the evaluation report.		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**Purpose of the evaluation is made clear in the introductory part of the report. Objectives and scope of the evaluation are included and use is made of the DAC Evaluation criteria. These are though referred to as part of the findings only, not in the introduction of the report.**		

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks	C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?	Constructive feedback for future reports
15 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.	Yes	Methodology used in the evaluation is specified. Mention is made of purposive sampling, though this is not further specified.	**C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?** The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes. The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
16 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	Yes	Data sources are specified. Mention is made of an *'information needs framework'* that has been developed though the framework is not included as an annex to the report.		
17 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	No	There is no explicit attention to ethical considerations, this while in the methodology interviews with students are included which means that children were interviewed.		
18 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors	Almost			
19 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	Almost	There is mention of a School Management Information System (SMIS) but the system and the data concerned are not assessed. There is moreover no use of a results framework of CFS to guide the evaluation and also the three criteria for CFS (i.e. inclusiveness, child-centeredness and democratic participation) are not used as such.	**Confident to Act** The combination of methodologies used can be expected to answer the evaluation questions. Nevertheless there are various limitations including lack of reference to ethical concerns and safeguards though children were interviewed, no analysis of the existing M&E system (SMIS) and no analysis of rights issues (which closely link with inclusiveness, one of the key characteristics of CFS).	As part of the TOR of an evaluation it would be useful to include a requirement to look at ethical issues and put safeguards in place, in particular when children are being interviewed and refer to the UNICEF guidelines concerned.
20 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's log frame or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.	No			
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender & child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.	No	There is no assessment of gender and other rights aspects, though the methodology as such could have allowed for this. For example, there is no assessment of the level of inclusiveness in schools visited by the evaluation mission, though inclusiveness is one of the three criteria for CFS.		

22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women & child rights) aspects?
The inclusion of human rights and gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned.

No

23 Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope? If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of social exclusion, disparities & equity.	Almost			
24 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.	No	No details provided, though throughout the report it appears that stakeholders are informants to the evaluation, which is useful.		
25 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.	Yes			
26 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.	Almost	One of the schools visited was not a CFS but this is not made explicit as part of the methodology nor is information analyzed through systematic comparison of this one school with the Child-Friendly schools.		
27 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.	Yes	The combination of methods used can be expected to answer the evaluation questions.		
28 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings	Yes	Lack of baseline data for the pilot schools is identified as a constraint to the assessment. This can be considered acceptable for the task at hand.		
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The combination of methods used can be expected to be able to answer the evaluation questions. Nevertheless there are various limitations to the methodology including a lack of attention to ethical issues and lack of review of the existing M&E system and data.			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?	Constructive feedback for future reports
29 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Almost	Findings in the report are provided without reference to evidence concerned. When presenting data on DAC criteria the discussion remains superficial and is pre-empted by the following remark: *"... There is insufficient evidence to respond to the broad and comprehensive questions framed in the TOR, and evidence should continue to be collected."*	**D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?** Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
30 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Almost	Though partly findings are organised according to the DAC evaluation criteria, coverage of those criteria is only superficial and not convincing. There is few distinction between the various levels of the results chain.		
31 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Almost		**Almost Confident to Act** — The report does not provide clear evidence for the findings that it describes. When presenting data on DAC criteria the discussion remains superficial, not comprehensively covering the essence of the issues concerned. Though some of the findings are unexpected, there is no further explanation provided. No cost analysis is included. Findings are not related to contributions of stakeholders. Views of diverse stakeholders are presented in the report. There is a lack of attention to accomplishments and failures and reasons concerned. There is no clear set of conclusions presented.	The structure of the report needs to be incorporated in the TOR, with clear reference to formulation of conclusions based on findings. Review of the quality of the draft evaluation report needs to include attention to a relevant set of conclusions. Useful reference can be made to UNICEF adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards.
32 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Almost			
33 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	No	No real attention is paid to unexpected findings. The fact that there were no noticeable differences between CFS and non-CFS focus group discussion is mentioned but not further discussed or explained. There is no systematic attention to cost analysis and issues of efficiency.		
34 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	No			
35 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.	No	The evaluation does pay attention to viewpoints of various stakeholders though the presentation is mixed with methodological issues which is not a useful approach and limits the		

36 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.	Yes	not a useful approach and limits the information provided on stakeholder perspectives.
37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Almost	There is limited attention to accomplishments and failures and to reasons behind these.
38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.	Almost	No real attention to continuing constraints.
39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.	Almost	There is no clear set of conclusions presented throughout the evaluation report, nor is there a separate section on conclusions. In terms of findings though there is attention to both strengths and weaknesses of CFS.
40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.	No	
41 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).	No	There is no clear set of conclusions presented.
Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The report does not provide clear evidence for the findings that it describes. When presenting data on DAC criteria the discussion remains superficial, not comprehensively covering the essence of the issues concerned. There is no clear set of conclusions presented.**

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Almost	Recommendations are only loosely linked to the findings. They are very generic and could have been made without any findings as they concern development of an action plan, creating a coordination committee, selecting a methodology for expansion, revising the Standards Framework and tracking progress. The recommendations do not provide details on how to do this and who should be responsible for what.		
43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	The recommendations are relevant though overly generic and not targeted. There are nine recommendations which are not further prioritized.		
44 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Yes			
45 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Almost	For some recommendations target groups are included though responsibilities are not made explicit. Recommendations appear realistic.	Almost Confident to Act — Recommendations are only loosely linked to the findings. They are overly generic and do not specify how to implement changes and who would be responsible. Thus they do not add much value beyond generic guidance on planning, coordination and monitoring and evaluation. No lessons learned have been identified.	A validation meeting to discuss the results of the evaluation, including the recommendations, with key stakeholders is an important means to enhance agreement on results and recommendations and to seek buy-in from the various parties concerned. It is useful to include such a meeting as part of the TOR.
46 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Yes			
47 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No	No details provided.		
48 Where presented, are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	N/A	No lessons learned identified		
49 Where presented, are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	N/A	No lessons learned identified		

Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	Recommendations are only loosely linked to the findings. They are very generic in nature and do not specify how to implement changes and who would be responsible. Thus they do not add much value beyond generic guidance on planning, coordination and monitoring and evaluation. No lessons learned have been identified so this issue is considered not applicable.

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
50. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Outstanding	Opening pages are complete		
51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	Yes	Yes, included.	The structure of the report is not very consistent with issues of purpose, objectives and methodology scattered through the report and no separate section on conclusions. The executive summary is included but overemphasizes context at the expense of object of the evaluation and the objectives / scope of the evaluation. Thus the summary cannot be expected to be able to inform decision-making.	In the review of any draft evaluation report the quality of the summary needs to be included as part of the quality assessment and it needs to be ascertained that all elements needed for an executive summary are included so that the summary can stand alone and better inform decision-making.
52 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Almost	The executive summary is included but overemphasizes context at the expense of object of the evaluation (the CFS pilot schools) and the objectives / scope of the evaluation (what the evaluation is meant to cover) and what criteria will be used to guide the assessment. thus the summary cannot really stand alone and the expectations for informing decision-making can only be limited.		
53 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Almost			
54 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Almost			
55 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Almost	The structure of the report is not that clear with issues of purpose, objectives and methodology scattered through the report and no separate section on conclusions.		
56 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes	Annexes contain TOR, field notes, CFS standards (the second deliverable of the assignment) and a field report. In particular the review of the CFS Standard Framework adds to the report.		
57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes			
58 Is the style of the report human rights compliant? This includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups	Almost	Reporting style is mainly descriptive and not analytic.		

Overall rating column (spanning): Almost Confident to Act

Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The structure of the report is not very consistent with issues of purpose, objectives and methodology scattered through the report and no separate set of conclusions. The executive summary is included but overemphasizes context and cannot be expected to be able to inform decision-making.

Additional Information	
Question	**Remarks**
i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	Though the TOR is included, it is incomplete only including context and purpose. Thus it cannot be assessed to what extent the evaluation actually addressed the objectives and scope of the evaluation as mentioned in the TOR as those details are missing from the TOR that is appended.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	Context is clearly explained in terms of Education in Armenia, as well as in the wider global context of the development of the CFS concept and the global Education for All initiative. This is related to the CFS project to be evaluated. Good practice also concerns the description of the role of the various donor agencies in terms of support to education development.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	

OVERALL RATING			
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?** This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Almost	Object of the evaluation, Purpose and Objectives and Methodology are *Confident to Act*. The Findings and Conclusions and Recommendations and lessons learned however, cannot be considered of sufficient quality, nor can the structure of the report.	Almost Confident to Act — Though the object of the evaluation is described, purpose and objectives become clear and the methodology can be expected to be able to answer the evaluation questions, the report does not ground findings in clear evidence and does not provide a concise set of conclusions on which recommendations can be based. The latter are overly generic and not targeted, nor prioritized. Thus the report cannot provide the confidence needed for a quality evaluation report.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Almost	With the findings and conclusions not up to quality standards, the report cannot be considered confident to act.	
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.			

Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	With a little more work, this report could be satisfactory. The Child Friendly School Pilot project, which is the object of the evaluation, is described in the report. Good practice concerns the description of the role of the various donor agencies in terms of support to education development. Purpose of the evaluation is made clear and use is made of the DAC Evaluation criteria in terms of objectives of the evaluation. Findings in the report though, are not clearly grounded in evidence provided and the report does not come to a concise set of conclusions. Recommendations are overly generic, not targeted nor prioritized.