UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Colour Coding</td><td>CC</td><td>Dark green</td><td>Green</td><td>Amber</td><td>Red</td><td>White</td></tr>
<tr><td>Questions</td><td>Outstanding</td><td>Yes</td><td>Almost</td><td>No</td><td>Not Applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td>Section & Overall Rating</td><td>Outstanding/ Very Confident to Act</td><td>Good/ Confident to Act</td><td>Almost satisfactory /Almost Confident to Act</td><td>Unsatisfactory/ Not Confident to Act</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

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	EVALUACIÓN DEL APOYO DE UNICEF A LA EDUCACIÓN MUNICIPAL EN LA COMUNA DE CONCHALÍ				
Report sequence number	2008/008	**Date of Review**	16/12/10	**Year of the Evaluation Report**	2008
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office			**Country(ies)**	Chile
Type of Report	Evaluation			**TORs Present**	No
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)*	3.1 Pilot: Where a new solution, approach, or programme is being tested at a national or sub-national level, the evaluation examines the efficacy of such an intervention with the intention to determine suitability for scaling-up.	
Result *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control	
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)*	6.2 Independent internal: The evaluation is implemented by consultants but managed in-house by UNICEF professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies within the division whose work is being evaluated.	
Timing / Stage	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the 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	Comprehensive description including historical perspective.	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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Almost	The theory of change / logic model is not described though aspects become apparent through a discussion of effectiveness		
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	Yes	Context is a core feature of the evaluation framework and is described in a section on the schooling system in the target area		
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	Yes	Stakeholders are identified and the role of UNIFEM and other stakeholders' in contributing to project success is clearly set out and is part of the evaluation framework. Financial contributions are not described,	The object of the evaluation is well described although the theory of change is implicit rather than explicit. The context is a key part of the evaluation framework and is clearly set out.	The use of an evaluation framework which includes specific parameters on context is good practice.
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	Yes			
6 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
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	Yes	It is made clear that the evaluation is being commissioned near the end of the implementation period.		
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	The context is clearly linked to the findings.		

(Confident to Act)

Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	There is a clear description of the object of the evaluation plus a strong focus on context (which is part of the evaluation framework). The description of the theory of change / results chain could be more explicit.

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 and objectives of the evaluation are identified and the rationale for commissioning the evaluation at the particular point in time is also clearly set out. The scope of the evaluation is not fully described.	**B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?** 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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *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)*	Almost	The DAC criteria are not referenced. However, the basis of the evaluation is effectiveness, and relevance and sustainability are covered implicitly. There is a comprehensive discussion on the understandings of effectiveness used in the evaluation.	Almost Confident to Act — The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, as well as the rationale for its commissioning at the particular point in time. Objectives are clearly set out, though not scope. The main criterion of effectiveness is described but no explanation is provided for its use nor for not making use of other evaluation criteria.	Reports should require the explicit use of DAC evaluation criteria
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.	Almost	There is a clear rationale for using effectiveness (basis of project design) - though this does not reference the DAC criterion.		
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	No	No explicit reference to rights frameworks although some of the evaluation questions lend themselves to a rights analysis.		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		The purpose and objective of the evaluation are clearly defined, as well as the rationale for its commissioning at the particular point in time. However the scope is not fully described, and the DAC evaluation criteria are not referenced, although the understanding of effectiveness used is well addressed.		

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	The methodology is clearly set out and the enquiry framework included. The rationale could be more extensively described.	**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	Almost	The methodology is heavily based on interviews and documentary sources as well as the use of baseline data. There could be more discussion of other methodological options and means for triangulation. Ethical considerations and safeguards are not included		
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 discussion of ethical issues or safeguards.		
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	No			

Question	cc	Remarks	Almost Confident to Act	C/ methodology	Feedback
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.	Yes	The monitoring and evaluation system is an explicit part of the evaluation framework and is well covered. While there is no explicit use of the project's results framework, the understanding of effectiveness used is clearly set out.	**Almost Confident to Act**	The report clearly describes the methodology applied, and the evaluation framework is helpfully set out. However, the methodology could be more comprehensive in terms of responding to the questions and there is little justification of the methods used / recognition of alternative methodological approaches.	Evaluation managers should agree the methodology with consultancy teams before fieldwork takes place.
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 logframe 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.	Almost				
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	The evaluation framework and methodology do not take an explicitly rights-based approach and gender is not a feature of either the design or the research / analysis process. However, the methodology would present an opportunity to mainstream human rights including gender issues			
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				

Question	Rating	Comments
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.	N/A	
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.	Yes	There has been extensive consultation with a range of stakeholders and a clear rationale is presented for this. The interviews were heavily weighted towards officials rather than project beneficiaries.
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.	Almost	
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.	No	This would have been feasible but has not been attempted.
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.	Almost	Given that the evaluation is largely formative, the methodology provides a means for mostly - though not completely - answering the questions. Survey methods for example would supported the process
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	Almost	Limitations around the project which have affected the evaluation are clearly described, but there is a weakness in describing methodological limitations e.g. bias.
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		The report clearly describes the methodology applied, and this mostly - though not completely - enables a good response to the questions asked. However there is little justification of the methods used and little discussion of triangulation.

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	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*
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.	Yes	Findings (results) are generated based on the evidence presented although the distinction between outputs, outcomes and impacts are implicit rather than explicit. The data is not used selectively i.e. the 'whole story' appears to be told.		
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.	Yes	The findings address all of the evaluation questions systematically, though the logical progression from implementation to results is not clearly drawn out. Some gaps and limitations are described but some are not recognised or made clear.		
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		Confident to Act	Findings are grounded in the evidence presented, though the progression from implementation to results could be more clearly drawn out. The contributions of the various stakeholders are well described. Conclusions add value to the findings.	Evaluation ToRs should reflect the requirement for evaluators to include explanatory factors / variables.
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.	N/A	The formative nature of the evaluation did not request - or lend itself to - a cost analysis and there are no unexpected findings described.		
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.	N/A			
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.	Yes	This is one of the strengths of the report; the contribution of individual stakeholders is clearly identified and the conclusions are based on the full cross-section of stakeholders.		
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			
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)*	Yes	The report is strong on explanatory factors and variables.		

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.	Yes	The report addresses well the limitations of the design in terms of implications for the future.	
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.	Yes	Yes, the conclusions are clear about the strengths and weaknesses of the project, although more explicit reference to human rights and to the stronger feature could be made. Some of the conclusions do add value beyond the immediate issues of implementation.	
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.	Almost		
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).	Yes	The conclusions of the evaluation are pitched at a level that is appropriate for the stakeholders / users of the report.	

Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**Findings respond directly to the evaluation questions set out and make explicit and comprehensive use of the evidence base. Conclusions are logically derived from the findings and add insights relevant to the evaluation's object and purpose.**

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?	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.	N/A	No explicit recommendations included although these may not have been requested (they are not referred to in the description of the evaluation's requirements) and some are implicit within the lessons learned / conclusions section.	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.	
43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	N/A			
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.	N/A			
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.	N/A		Not Confident to Act — Rating awarded due to lack of explicit recommendations.	Recommendations should be a requirement of all reports.
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	N/A			
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.	N/A			
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.	Almost	Lessons learned are grounded in the findings. most are project-specific, while some of the lessons identified do have resonance beyond the project's context.		
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.	Almost	The lessons learned are partly generalised for broader relevance.		
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	Awarded a 'not confident to act' rating since recommendations are not provided - though these were perhaps not requested. The lessons learned are well grounded in findings although mostly not generalised for wider relevance.			

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	Almost	All present other than list of acronyms		
51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	No	Not included	The report is logically structured and written in clear and coherent language, but needs an executive summary, list of acronyms and expanded annexes to be complete, as well as applying a rights based approach more systematically.	Final versions of reports should be required to include an Executive Summary.
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	N/A	N/A		
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	N/A			
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.	N/A			
55 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	Yes, the structure is logical.		
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	Almost	The data collection tools and bibliography are included but not the list of interviewees and site visits.		
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	No	A rights-based approach is not very evident in either the design or the style of the report.		

Column header (vertical): **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 report is logically structured and written in clear and coherent language, but needs an executive summary, list of acronyms and expanded annexes to be complete, as well as applying a more explicit rights based approach.

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	The evaluation addresses the questions as set out in the introductory section, No Terms of Reference are provided - this should be mandatory for all reports to provide in future.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The participatory methodologies applied plus the design and explanation of the Evaluation Framework are aspects of good practice.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	The partnerships between UNICEF and stakeholders is a strength

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	The methodology is clearly described and provides a means for mostly - though not wholly - answering the questions. The evidence generated - although it could usefully be supplemented from other sources - does provide a fair evidence base. Findings are logically derived from the evidence; however there are no specific recommendations and a lack of generalised lessons learned.	Almost Confident to Act This rating is derived from the main strengths and weaknesses of the report: the use of a clearly-described and participatory evaluation framework, good analysis, and a strong participatory approach which has reached out to a range of stakeholders. However, methodology is not complete with insufficient options for triangulation. recommendations are not included and the evaluation does not take an explicitly rights-based approach.
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	The lack of recommendations is an omission, and there is no executive summary, but otherwise there is a clear logical flow.	
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.		Recommendations may not have been required by the commissioning team. The focus as described in the objectives of the evaluation is very much on lessons learned.	
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. This rating is derived from the main strengths and weaknesses of the report: the use of a clearly-described and participatory evaluation framework, good analysis, and a strong participatory approach which has reached out to a range of stakeholders. However, methodology is not complete with insufficient options for triangulation. Recommendations are not included and the evaluation does not take an explicitly rights-based approach.**		