



UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	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 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	La Garantía y La Protección de Derechos De La Infancia, La Adolescencia y La Juventud En Los Planes De Desarrollo de Los Departamentos y Los Municipios de Colombia, 2008-2011				
Report sequence number	2008/003	Date of Review	18/12/2010	Year of the Evaluation Report	2008
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office			Country(ies)	Colombia
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	No
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.				
Management <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.4 Country-led or Jointly Managed with Country: Evaluations managed by the Country (Government and/or CSO) or jointly managed by the Country (Government and/or CSO) and the UNICEF CO				
Purpose <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.3 Policy: An evaluation whose main purpose is to examine the results of a policy that is delinked from field-based programming operations.				
Result <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	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				Seeking to assess how far a policy initiative has influenced local planning documents. Does not go as far as impact on beneficiaries.
MTSP Correspondence <i>(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)</i>	5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equity, knowledge management, evaluation, & communication for development.				
	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (4. Child Protection)				
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.1 Self-evaluation: A significant component of evaluation management activities & decision-making about the evaluation are implemented by individuals associated with the target programme/intervention (eg. programmes officer/specialists)				
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				The policy initiative is ongoing but the evaluation aims to assess progress in terms of influencing other documentary forms of planning.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION						
Question	cc	Remarks				
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	The aims of the policy initiative (to mainstream child / youth rights across departmental and municipal planning processes) is well described, as is the rationale for this, as are the partners and the implementation process.	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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>		
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	There is no explicit results chain cited but the theory of change (while not labelled as such) is described in general terms.				
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	There is an excellent description of the context including the relevant poverty indicators, policy frameworks and institutional actors.				
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 clear description of the relevant actors, including their functions as duty-bearers, and their contributions, including those of UNICEF (who were involved in the policy initiative).			Confident to Act Although there is no clear description of a results chain (not developed for the policy initiative), the theory of change is described and the anticipated outcomes and impacts set out. There is a very good description of context including strategies, priorities, institutional structures and actors.	For policy-level evaluations, the discussion of context relevant to the initiative is very important.
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	Yes, the policy initiative is ongoing.				
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.	Outstanding	Yes, the context adds considerable insight to the findings.				
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>		Although there is no clear description of a results chain (not developed for the policy initiative), the theory of change is described and the anticipated outcomes and impacts set out. There is a very good description of context including strategies, priorities, institutional structures and actors.				

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The purpose of the evaluation is clearly stated and the rationale and potential use of the evaluation explained. The objectives are related to the purpose and are very succinct. The scope of the evaluation is described in terms of coverage etc; this is very specifically around the prevalence of child and youth rights issues in development planning at departmental and municipal planning.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>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)</p>	Yes			
<p>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 <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Almost	<p>The criteria / value judgements cited are not the OECD DAC criteria but are rather around frequency (of occurrence in policy documentation). Human rights is effectively a criterion since this is the direct subject of the evaluation. Effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact could all have been used of the OECD DAC criteria.</p>	<p>Confident to Act</p> <p>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are very specific and very clearly defined, and there is clear interlinking between these elements. Although the evaluation does not seek to use the OECD DAC criteria - which it could easily have done - it does make clear the basis of its value judgements. There is a clear and sustained focus on human rights (including gender)</p>	<p>Evaluations should be required to apply the DAC evaluation standards - even more the case when the evaluation is a joint country-UNICEF activity.</p>
<p>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.</p>	N/A	<p>Not applicable</p>		
<p>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</p>	Yes	<p>There is a clear and sustained use of a human rights approach in terms of the evaluation design and some - though not comprehensive - analysis of gender.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are very specific and clearly defined, and there is clear interlinking between these elements. Although the evaluation does not seek to use the OECD DAC criteria - which it could easily have done - it does make clear the basis of its value judgements, and there is a clear and sustained focus on human rights.</p>			

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The data collection methods are quite simple, conducting textual analysis of relevant plans. The categories for and approaches to data analysis are well described. There is clear discussion of sampling.</p>	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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</p>	Yes	<p>Sources are specified and the rationale for their selection (aimed at a comprehensive sample - achieved 96%) are set out. There is discussion within the findings sections of some of the limitations of the sources.</p>		
<p>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</p>	N/A	<p>Considered not applicable as textual analysis of available official publications.</p>		
<p>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</p>	N/A			
<p>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.</p>	N/A	<p>Not applicable - the evaluation itself (preceded by another similar review) forms part of the performance monitoring system.</p>	<p>Confident to Act</p> <p>The methodology is transparently and comprehensively described; it is specifically focused on the limited aims of the study and as such addresses all the relevant areas (tools for analysis, efforts to limit bias etc). The methodology is focused through its subject on human rights and the analysis includes a focus on gender.</p>	<p>The section on controlling bias in documentary data analysis would be a helpful example for other similar studies.</p>
<p>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.</p>	N/A			
<p>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.</p>	N/A	<p>The evaluation itself is part of the rights-based performance monitoring system of the object; human rights is the focus of the study - a gender dimension is included though could have been given more prominence.</p>		

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.

Yes



<p>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.</p>	Yes				
<p>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.</p>	Yes	Given the aims and objectives of the study, the levels of participation (minimal) are appropriate.			
<p>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.</p>	Yes				
<p>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.</p>	N/A	Not applicable			
<p>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.</p>	Yes	The methodology is robust for the aims of the study, which are limited to frequency of occurrence. Had the study been asking more in-depth questions - 'why' the extent of occurrence, what did the occurrence lead to in terms of change - then a broader methodological basis would have been required.			
<p>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</p>	Yes	There is a very good section on efforts to control bias in terms of data analysis plus limitations in the data analysis process in the findings section. Some of the wider limitations of the methodology (e.g. the methodology does not seek to provide explanations for why or why not the findings occur) could be added.			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>A transparently and comprehensively described methodology, specifically focused on the limited aims of the study and which addresses all the relevant areas, including tools for analysis and efforts to limit bias. The methodology is focused through its subject on human rights and there is a focus on gender.</p>				

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?	
<p>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.</p>	Yes	Findings (all in terms of outputs i.e. frequency of occurrence) are clearly presented and the evidence base is cited continuously.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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.</p>	Yes	The findings respond to all the questions of the study in a systematic way, and show progression in the sense of reflecting on the process from the implementation of the initiative through the findings of the first evaluation through to the current findings of this second study. There is discussion of limitations encountered in one area.		
<p>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.</p>	Yes			
<p>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.</p>	Yes		<p>Almost Confident to Act</p> <p>Findings are clearly presented and based on sound evidence and robust data analysis; they respond comprehensively to the evaluation questions and objectives. Conclusions are however weaker and, while they present reasonable judgements, they are mainly a summary of findings rather than adding value or insight.</p>	<p>A description / some guidance of UNICEF's expectations around conclusions would have been useful for this particular evaluation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	Yes	There are no notably unexpected findings but areas of emphasis / intensity or lightness in frequency are highlighted and discussed. Cost analysis is not required or appropriate at this stage for this evaluation.		
<p>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.</p>	N/A			
<p>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.</p>	N/A	It would be methodologically difficult / unfeasible within an evaluation of a joint policy initiative to assign contribution for results to specific stakeholders.		
<p>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.</p>	N/A			
<p>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. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes	Within the limitations of the study, explanatory factors are discussed as much as is viable.		

<p>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.</p>	Yes	The implications of limited policy dissemination in the future are discussed.		
<p>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.</p>	Yes	The conclusions which are presented at the end of each section are really summary findings - though they do provide a balanced view of the object. The general conclusions at the end of the study are similarly limited, and are in fact a mix of summary findings, conclusions and recommendations. They do not generally add insights into important issues.		
<p>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.</p>	No	The conclusions are pitched at an appropriate level, and do provide a useful summary of the findings, but the issue is that they do not provide much additional insight or add much value.		
<p>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).</p>	Almost			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Clearly presented findings, based on sound evidence and robust data analysis which responds comprehensively to the evaluation objectives and questions. Conclusions are however weaker and, while they present reasonable judgements, they are mainly a summary of findings rather than adding value or insight.</p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</p>	Yes	There are a very few recommendations distributed through the final conclusions section and these (though very limited) are grounded in the findings and conclusions	<p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</p>	Yes	There a very few light touch recommendations and while these are relevant to the object they are limited which reduces their value.		
<p>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.</p>	No			
<p>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.</p>	No	The recommendations are stated almost in passing, and are not linked to stakeholders, nor are they focused suggestions for action. They are generalised rather than specific.	<p>Not Confident to Act</p> <p>Recommendations are a limitation of the report: they are only slightly referred to within the 'general conclusions' section and while they are relevant to the object, they are so limited in scope / generalised which limits their value. Lessons learned are not included.</p>	<p>Specific, targeted recommendations should be a requirement of all reports.</p>
<p>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</p>	No			
<p>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.</p>	No	No process is referenced.		
<p>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.</p>	N/A	Not presented		
<p>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.</p>	N/A	Not presented		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Recommendations are a limitation of the report: they are only slightly referred to within the 'general conclusions' section and while they are relevant to the object, they are limited in scope / generalised which reduced their value. Lessons learned are not included.</p>			

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?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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	The only missing element is the list of acronyms.	Almost Confident to Act	A limited number of pages plus an executive summary should be requirements in the ToR.
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		
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	Not applicable		
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	Almost	The structure is logical if very dense; the omissions of recommendations and lessons learned are a significant gap.		
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	There is only one Annex which is the ranking of entities based on the analysis; this adds value, though some of the methodological detail could usefully have been included in an Annex		
57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Almost			
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	Yes/Almost	Generally yes, although the focus on gender could have been more prominent.		
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The report is well structured and logical but is incomplete, needing an executive summary in particular. It reads well, but is very lengthy - perhaps some of the detail in the findings could have been compressed.			

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	ToR not included - recommend that all evaluations include the ToR in future.		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	Good practice included in the methodology, particularly the approaches for avoiding bias in documentary analysis		
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	Confidence could be had in sections A,B and C: the report is strong as far as findings are concerned, but its weaknesses are in the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.	Confident to Act The report is assessed as 'confident to act' overall because its methodology and analytical approach are very robust for its limited aims, and consequently findings generated are sound, well-evidenced and respond comprehensively to the evaluation requirements. Conclusions are weaker, and recommendations / lessons learned virtually absent, but in its own (limited) terms - and in terms of its likely relevance to stakeholders across Colombia - it is credible and useful.
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'.	Yes	The report is logically structured and there is good internal consistency and coherence; it holds together as a whole despite being very long.	
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.		The requirement for the evaluation was an analysis of the prevalence in documentation of a particular issue. Therefore, all the aspects of the review template do not apply or have less relevance e.g. lessons learned.	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	This report can be used with confidence. The methodology and analytical approach are very robust for its limited aims, and consequently findings generated are sound, well-evidenced and respond comprehensively to the evaluation questions. Conclusions are weaker, and recommendations / lessons learned virtually absent, but in its own (limited) terms - and in terms of its likely relevance to stakeholders across Colombia - it is credible and useful.		