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## OVERALL RATING

- **Satisfactory**

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

## SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

- **Highly Satisfactory**

  The report does a good job at describing the object of the evaluation including the way it was aligned with and related to other uses of the ECD kit as well as the evolution of the said instrument and its implementation guidelines. The report provides a description of the initiative’s coverage, its budget, implementing actors and their roles and contributions. Also, the report describes the beneficiaries of the ECD intervention and provides an overview of the context in which it operated as well as a description of the realities around living in a refugee settlement, which helps to facilitate the reader’s understanding of the particularities and challenges of implementing under these circumstances. The report also presents a complete description of the initiative’s Theory of Change. Finally, the report discusses the relative importance of the ECD initiative to UNICEF in humanitarian contexts.

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

- **Satisfactory**

  The report states that the evaluation has a learning purpose and a description is provided of what the evaluation is expected to achieve. Furthermore, the intended use and intended primary users of the evaluation are duly described. On the other hand, even though the report describes the thematic and geographic scope of the evaluation, the latter as well as the chronological coverage of the evaluation are not discussed in sufficient detail. Similarly, a rationale for the decisions made in this sense, including a justification for anything left out of the said scope, is not provided.

## SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)
Fair

The evaluation used two guiding criteria aligned with standard OECD/DAC, i.e. relevance and effectiveness, and key evaluation questions were used to guide the assessment. Furthermore, the full evaluation matrix is included in Annex B, which features evaluation questions, sub-questions the methods used to answer the questions, as well as the level of results to which they belonged in the theory of change. However, the report does not explain the reasons why the sustainability, impact and efficiency criteria were not included in the scope of analysis. The report explains that the evaluation used mixed methods including quantitative data that was obtained exclusively from secondary data. Furthermore, the qualitative approach is fully described and data collection tools and methods are listed, e.g. Key Information Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, as well as direct observation. Similarly, the data analysis methods used are explained as well as the quality assurance process through triangulation of evidence from different sources and levels. Additionally, sampling methods are explained in much detail. On the other hand, while methodological and operational limitations are correctly identified and explained, mitigation strategies to identify ways in which the evaluators attempted to overcome the limitations are not consistently provided. Finally, the report discusses the ethical considerations applied during the conduct of the evaluation. However, the ethical obligations of the evaluators are not listed.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory

The report is strong at presenting findings that are supported by robust evidence that is drawn from different sources, and they make reference to both strengths and areas for improvement. The findings are organized according to the evaluation criteria, they respond to key evaluation questions, and the initiative’s performance is consistently discussed in relation to its results framework. On the other hand, the report does not present a description and analysis of any unintended positive or negative effects produced by the initiative. Finally, the report does not provide enough detail around the initiative’s M&E system, and the way this system informed decision-making regarding programming is not clear.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The report presents conclusions that are correctly drawn from the evidence presented in the findings section and they provide a deeper level of analysis as to the strengths and areas for improvement in each programme component. Also, the conclusions convey a forward-looking perspective and discuss foreseeable implications in future programming in this area. Finally, the report presents correctly identified lessons learned that are formulated so as to signify what wider relevance they could have in other initiatives and different contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)
Satisfactory

The report presents three recommendations that are logically drawn from the information provided in the findings and conclusions, and they are detailed enough so as to provide stakeholders with clear indications regarding how to go about implementing them. Also, recommendations clearly identify the target stakeholders for action in each case and are prioritized. Conversely, the process followed in developing the recommendations as well as the level of stakeholder participation in their validation are not discussed in the report.

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

Satisfactory

The report follows, for the most part, a logical order and observes the standard order of sections and subsections that are clearly indicated. However, the report starts by describing the evaluation context and then moves on to describing the context surrounding the initiative which does not favour the reader's comprehension of the latter. The opening pages of the report include all of the necessary elements to readily inform the reader about the evaluation, including the name of the evaluation object, name of the commissioning organization, name of the evaluator, timeframe to be evaluated, date of submission of the report, as well as a table of contents, and acronyms. Finally, the annexes present several elements that contribute to increasing the overall quality of the report such as the Terms of Reference, the evaluation matrix, data collection tools, etc.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The report explicitly states the use of a rights-based approach and uses language that reflects this throughout the report. On the other hand, while the report states that an evaluation reference group was in place, its composition and the concrete ways in which the stakeholders contributed to the evaluation process beyond their role as informants is not sufficiently discussed. The report assesses the extent to which equity and gender considerations were integrated in the design and implementation of the initiative. Furthermore, the scope of the evaluation analysis includes gender-related questions and the evaluation consistently uses gender-disaggregated data. However, while women and men were consulted, the methodology does not sufficiently explain the extent to which a gender-sensitive approaches were used in collecting data. Finally, the findings, conclusions and recommendations include to some extent a gender analysis, although this could have been more exhaustive.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The report includes an executive summary that is both complete and succinct and that presents a brief overview of the initiative, as well as the evaluation methodology, key findings and conclusions and recommendations. On the other hand, a brief summary of the refugee settlement context in which the initiative was implemented is absent and would have provided the reader with a better overall understanding of the evaluation. Finally, the executive summary only includes information that is developed in further depth in the body of the report, which is good practice.

### Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations for improvement

This is a good quality report that can be used with confidence by decision-makers, as it provides evidence-based findings and actionable recommendations. In the future, the evaluation manager could work with the evaluation team to ensure that a gender perspective be used in the evaluation methodology and that gender be mainstreamed throughout the report. It would be useful to outline gender related expectations within the ToRs. Also, while it is indeed good practice to form an evaluation reference group, the evaluation manager should ensure that the report include a section that discusses how the reference group guided and assisted the evaluators throughout the evaluation process. Finally, it is good practice to include in the scope of analysis questions that inquire about the occurrence of positive or negative unintended effects, especially in humanitarian contexts, as these often provide an opportunity to inform on practical ways to adjust and enhance programming. A question around unexpected effects could be included by the evaluation manager in the ToRs.

### Lessons for managing future evaluations:

**Section A**

This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section B**

It is recommended that the report dedicate a clear section to discussing the scope of the evaluation in detail including what the assessment set out to cover in chronological, thematic and geographic terms as well as the reasons that justify the choices made in this regard. Also, good practices recommend that the report present a discussion around what aspects were excluded (if any) from the scope of analysis and the reasons for this.

**Section C**

GEROS standards require that in the case that not all of the OECD/DAC standard criteria are included, an explicit justification for their absence be provided. Similarly, mitigation strategies should be provided for all of the identified limitations. Finally, it is important that the discussion around the ethical considerations used during the conduct of the evaluation include explicit reference to the ethical obligations of the evaluators, i.e. independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, and accountability.

**Section D**

Good practices recommend that unexpected positive and negative results of the initiative be identified as part of the assessment, and that an analysis of their occurrence and observed effects be presented. This kind of assessment is oftentimes instrumental in providing insight into how the initiative could be adjusted and enhanced in the future. Similarly, GEROS standards require evaluations to provide a complete assessment of the initiative's M&E system and to discuss the extent to which the system informs decision-making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>This section observes good practices. No further improvements are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>GEROS standards require evaluation reports to provide a discussion regarding the process followed in developing the recommendations. As part of this discussion, the level of stakeholder participation should be identified, including a rationale for this particular level of involvement. Stakeholder engagement in the development and/or validation of recommendations helps to make them more usable and encourages stakeholder ownership during their implementation. A stakeholder recommendations validation workshop can be a useful tool to engage stakeholders in their development and/or validation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>For clarity purposes, it is recommended that the report begin by providing a full description of the object of the evaluation, followed by a description of the refugee settlement context and then go on to explain the evaluation itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Good practices recommend that a thorough description be provided as to how stakeholders participated in the evaluation beyond their roles as informants. This could be done, for instance, by discussing the role and contributions of the evaluation reference group in the validation of the recommendations. Also, it is important that the evaluation present concrete examples of the way the methodology used gender-sensitive methods and tools. The report should also include a consistent gender analysis that continues through to the conclusions and recommendations. For more information on how to conduct gender-sensitive evaluations, please visit: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>It would be useful for the executive summary to include a brief overview of the context of the initiative, which would contribute to providing a more thorough understanding of their particular needs and the nature of the initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>