

EVALUATION ID	1380-2013/002
---------------	---------------

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
Section & Overall Rating		Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

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	Programa Conjunto Reducción de Violencia Y Construcción de Capital Social en El Salvador "Proyecto de Prevención y Atención de Violencia en Centros Educativos del Municipio de San Salvador"
Report sequence number	2013/002
Date of Review	13/06/2014
Year of the Evaluation Report	2013
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office
Country	El Salvador
Type of Report	Evaluation
TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	Universalia Management Group
Classification of Evaluation Report	
Comments	
Geographic Scope (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>)	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 of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)	2.6 Externally managed: An external organization manages the evaluation, where UNICEF is one of the organizations being assessed (UN and non-UN)
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives
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
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>)	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (1. Young child survival & development)
Level of Independence (<i>Implementation and control of the evaluation activities</i>)	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.
Approach	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION					
Question	cc	Remarks			
Object and context					
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	El objeto evaluado se encuentra bien descrito en las primeras secciones del reporte: "Introducción" (pg. 27) y "Modelo a evaluar" donde se exponen los componentes de las dos etapas que incluye el programa. El contexto se muestra adecuado para ubicar al lector y se desarrolla principalmente en la sección de "Antecedentes"(pg. 28 a 33). La profundidad y espectro del contexto sirven para informar los hallazgos.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
2 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				
3 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				
Theory of Change					
4 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	<p style="text-align: center;">Highly satisfactory</p> <p>Las dos primeras secciones del reporte incluyen la información necesaria para ubicar al lector sobre la evaluación. El programa así como las partes interesadas son identificadas de manera clara y el contexto en el que se les ubica permite informar los hallazgos. El Marco Lógico del Programa fue reconstruido por los evaluadores aunque las dos etapas que componen el programa no fueron incluidas. Información sobre la implementación del programa es presentada desde el inicio del reporte.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p> <p>El contexto contiene información pertinente para ubicar al lector. En la reconstrucción del Marco Lógico del Programa debió reflejarse las dos etapas por separado del programa y su interacción entre ellas.</p>		
Stakeholders and their contributions					
5 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				
6 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				
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Outstanding				
Implementation Status					
8 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				
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>	El objeto, el contexto, la participación de las diferentes partes interesadas así como el estatus sobre la implementación del programa se encuentran bien descritos. La reconstrucción del Marco Lógico del programa otorga luz para la comprensión del programa pero no refleja fielmente las dos etapas que componen el programa.				

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
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.	Mostly	El propósito de la evaluación se incluye en la Introducción (pg. 27) sin embargo, no es claro quién necesita la información y qué uso se le dará. Los objetivos de la evaluación se incluyen en la sección "Objetivo de la evaluación" (pg. 31). Los objetivos son coherentes con el alcance de la evaluación y su propósito.	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.
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	Yes		
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		
Evaluation framework			
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; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Yes	Los criterios de evaluación se encuentran claramente identificados. Además de los OCDE/DAC, se agregan aquellos de interés al Fondo Español de los objetivos del Milenio: valor agregado de la comunidad, coherencia/complementariedad en el uso de recursos. El uso de los criterios diferentes al OCDE/DAC son justificados.	Highly satisfactory El propósito, los objetivos y el alcance de la evaluación se encuentran bien enunciados, sin embargo el uso y los destinatarios de la información no fueron especificados. Los criterios de evaluación son claramente expuestos y aquellos que difieren de los OCDE/DAC son especificados.
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 non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Yes		
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>	El propósito, los objetivos y el alcance de la evaluación se encuentran bien enunciados, por el contrario el/los destinatarios y el uso de la información proveniente de la evaluación no fueron incluidos. Los criterio de evaluación se exponen de manera clara.		

Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

El destinatario y el uso que se le dará a la información proveniente de la evaluación deben de ser incluidos claramente en el reporte.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY		
Question	cc	Remarks
Data collection		
<p>14 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	Con respecto a la recolección de datos, el reporte enumera los métodos de recolección y la estrategia de muestreo se especifica que este fue estadístico aleatorio (pg. 34). Los instrumentos de recolección de datos fueron adaptados después de la fase piloto. En ella encontraron que eran de difícil entendimiento para los niños y niñas de primero, segundo y tercer grado, después de su adaptación se especifica que el primer año decidió no incluirse. Las partes interesadas que fueron parte de la evaluación se mencionan en la sección metodología de muestreo (pg. 33) al igual que las limitaciones a las que se enfrentaron los evaluadores.
<p>15 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	
Ethics		
<p>16 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>	No	La ética detrás del programa evaluada no fue abordada. Ninguna salvaguarda es mencionada ni para la recolección de los datos.
<p>17 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>	No	
Results Based Management		
<p>18 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>	No	El sistema de seguimiento y evaluación del programa evaluado no fue abordado en la evaluación.
<p>19 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>	No	
	Mostly Satisfactory	<p>Los instrumentos para la recolección de los datos fueron ajustados después de la fase piloto debido a la falta de entendimiento de los mismos por alumnos de primero, segundo y tercer año. Una vez hecho el ajuste se decidió no incluir a los grupos de primer año. Los instrumentos son variados. El aspecto ético fue dejado de lado. Ni un análisis sobre las implicaciones que trajo la implementación del programa, ni salvaguardas éticas durante la evaluación fueron incluidas. El sistema de seguimiento y evaluación del Programa no fue abordado. La metodología de evaluación integra</p>
		<p>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.</p>
		<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
		<p>El aspecto ético debe de ser incluido sobre todo por el tema del programa que se aborda: la violencia. La inclusión del análisis del sistema de seguimiento y evaluación es primordial, si el programa no lo tenía o la información no era confiable los evaluadores debieron hacerlo del conocimiento del lector. El diseño de una metodología que incluya una perspectiva de derechos humanos es recomendada. La implicación de las diferentes partes interesadas para la validación de la información obtenida de la evaluación es necesaria.</p>

Human Rights, Gender and Equity	
<p>20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?</p> <p>This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style 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</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Elementos de género y de equidad se abordan a lo largo de la evaluación. La metodología toma como referencia el documento de UNICEF "Cómo diseñar y gestionar evaluaciones centradas en la equidad" del 2012. Además, los datos que se presentan siempre son desagregados por género y la evidencia que se reporta intenta adoptar una perspectiva de género. La población objetivo del programa es reconocida cómo vulnerable desde el principio del reporte. Por el contrario, los evaluadores no mencionan ningún aspecto del sistema de seguimiento y evaluación del programa por lo que no podemos asesorar si este tiene o no una perspectiva de género, equidad o si incluye derechos humanos. La inclusión de elementos sobre derechos humanos es muy limitada y los conceptos de ostentador de derecho o garante de derechos no es incluida. Cuestiones sobre el empoderamiento de la mujer son limitadas, cómo se mencionó anteriormente si bien el reporte cuenta con elementos con perspectiva de género el análisis no es a profundidad. El aspecto de equidad se incluye al inicio del reporte, sin embargo este no trasmina hasta últimas secciones.</p>
<p>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks?</p> <p>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>	<p>No</p>
<p>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?</p> <p>The inclusion of human rights 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. 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.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</p> <p>The inclusion of 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. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>
<p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</p> <p>The inclusion of equity considerations 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. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>

algunos elementos de equidad, pero sólo lo hace al inicio del reporte, esta perspectiva no trasmina de manera estructurada hasta las conclusiones. Los elementos de género son incorporados de mejor manera. La perspectiva de derechos humanos no fue incluida. La participación de las diferentes partes interesadas pudo haber sido más a profundidad, en esta ocasión la mayoría sólo intervino a manera de fuente de información. El reporte se muestra débil en la asignación de atribución. El revisor no tuvo acceso a la matriz de evaluación por lo que es difícil pronunciarse sobre si todas las preguntas de evaluación fueron contestadas. Las limitaciones a las que hicieron frente los evaluadores fueron atendidas.

Stakeholder participation		
<p>25 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>	Mostly	La mayoría de las partes interesadas fue incluida en la evaluación, pero en carácter de fuente de información. Los evaluadores afirman que la metodología ha sido parcialmente participativa (pg. 32) y que las conclusiones del reporte son sólo del equipo evaluador. La validación de los hallazgos y de las conclusiones debió haber sido llevada a cabo, sobre todo con miras a un mejor entendimiento de las partes interesadas (alumnos y docentes).
<p>26 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>	No	
Methodological robustness		
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? 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>	No	El reporte no presenta ningún contrafactual y tampoco intenta dar atribución. A partir de la sección 3 "Análisis de los productos del Proyecto" el reporte está estructurado según las preguntas de la encuesta que se aplicó.
<p>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to 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	Esas preguntas fueron repondidas, sin embargo, la metodología utilizada y el cuadro de diseño utilizado en las áreas de investigación e Indicadores de la Metodología se encuentran en el anexo 1 (pg. 38) y el revisor no tuvo acceso a ellos. Las limitaciones reportadas por los consultores fueron atendidas de manera razonable (pg. 35)
<p>29 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	
<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>Los instrumentos para la recolección de datos fueron adecuados. La inclusión de un análisis más profundo sobre equidad y cuestiones de género es recomendada. La participación de las partes interesadas debió haber sido más allá de una fuente de información. Aspectos éticos, un análisis del sistema de seguimiento y evaluación debieron haber sido incluidos.</p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Completeness and logic of findings			
30 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.	Mostly	El reporte presenta desde la seccion 3 "Análisis de los productos del proyecto" (pg. 41) una serie de hechos provenientes de las encuestas. Cada pregunta es acompañada de una gráfica donde se reporta la estadística descriptiva. Sin embargo, los hallazgos se pierden en el cuerpo del texto y no existe un análisis que permita distinguir entre productos (outputs), efectos directos (outcomes) e impactos. De hecho este último no es abordado. En general, la información recabada contesta a los criterios de evaluación previamente establecidos, salvo por el criterio de impacto que no es expuesto de manera concreta. La matriz de evaluación no estuvo a disposición del revisor para aseverara que todas las preguntas fueron respondidas. En la sección 5 "Análisis de los resultados" se hace un recuento sobre el avance de las estrategias, actividades y procesos vinculados al proyecto (pg. 92) lo que ejemplifica de manera general la progresión de la implementación a la consecución de resultados. Las limitaciones enfrentadas a lo largo de la evaluación son mencionadas y las implicaciones que estas tuvieron en los hallazgos son discutidas (ej. la falta de participación de los padres de familia en los grupos focales).	Mostly Satisfactory
31 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.	Mostly		
32 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.	Yes		
33 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.	Yes		
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	No		
Cost Analysis			
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	No	Fuera de la mención del presupuesto total del programa, el tema de los costos no es profundizado.	
			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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
			El análisis sobre la sostenibilidad es bueno y se presenta a dos niveles. El primero a nivel del programa, el segundo a nivel de cada centro educativo. La presentación de los hallazgos debe hacerse por medio de un distintivo visual. Esto contribuiría a la legibilidad del reporte. Las conclusiones deben de ser más que el resumen de los hallazgos. Estas deben de proporcionar la opinión y juicio de los evaluadores con respecto al programa.

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 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>	Mostly	<p>La atribución de las partes interesadas hacia los resultados se hace de manera sucinta. Aspectos de éxito y fracaso son mencionados a profundidad en la sección 7 "Lecciones Aprendidas" que más que incluir contribuciones al conocimiento general son parte de las recomendaciones.</p>
<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	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<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	<p>La sección de sostenibilidad 8.3.2 (pg. 109 a 111) aborda los desafíos a los que enfrenta el programa a nivel general según el modelo implementado así como específicamente en los centros educativos.</p>
<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	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<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>	Mostly	<p>Las conclusiones presentadas, son más un resumen de los hallazgos encontrados. No existe una enunciación de problemas derivados del análisis de los mismos. Esta sección contiene los diferentes puntos de vista de las partes interesadas, como en la metodología, sin embargo la validación de la información es limitada (Sólo personal UNICEF, según lo establecido en los TDR). La información que se presenta en la sección de conclusiones es relevante para las diferentes partes interesadas y su lenguaje es accesible, pero como se mencionó anteriormente el análisis proveniente del mismo es limitado.</p>
<p>41 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>	Yes	
<p>42 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>	Yes	
<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>La identificación de los hallazgos en el cuerpo del texto es muy difícil. Las conclusiones no presentan un análisis más a profundidad que los hallazgos, en general, estas no son más que un resumen de los mismos. La atribución al igual que un análisis sobre los costos del programa fueron omitidos. Sin embargo, los criterios de evaluación fueron bien respondidos y la sección de sostenibilidad es muy pertinente.</p>	

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Mostly	Las recomendaciones se derivan de los hallazgos y de la evidencia recolectada. Sin embargo, estas no pueden estar respaldadas por las conclusiones debido a la debilidad en su formulación. No obstante, las recomendaciones son relevantes para el objeto y el propósito de la evaluación. El número de recomendaciones es muy grande y no se encuentran priorizadas.	<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes		
45 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.	No		
Usefulness of recommendations			
46 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.	No	<p>Las recomendaciones sobre el componente I "Prevención primaria de la violencia" están divididas por acción, eg. transformación pedagógica de la dirección mientras que las recomendaciones del componente II "Atención a casos de violencia" se presentan por actor ej. "Consejo consultivo zonales". Algunas de las recomendaciones no son accionables y ejecutables sobre todo aquellas sobre la Red de Apoyo Interinstitucional (pg. 116)</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>En general, las recomendaciones se encuentran basadas en la evidencia recolectada y son relevantes para el propósito de la evaluación. No obstante son demasiadas en número, no se encuentran priorizadas, no están dirigidas hacia una parte interesada específica y algunas de ellas sobre todo las referentes al Componente II "Atención a casos de violencia" no son accionables y ejecutables, sobre todo tomando en cuenta el retraso que tiene este elemento. Propias Lecciones Aprendidas no fueron incluidas.</p>
47 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	Mostly		
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No		
Appropriate lessons learned			
49 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.	No	<p>El reporte contiene una sección sobre lecciones aprendidas, sin embargo, esta sirve más como extensión de las recomendaciones que proporciona elementos sobre conocimiento más generalizados del programa que puedan ser aplicados a otros contextos.</p>	<p>Las recomendaciones tienen que ser pocas en número, claras, viables, buscando en todo momento ser accionables. Para acrecentar su accionabilidad es altamente recomendable dirigirlas a una parte interesada en específico. Las lecciones aprendidas por su parte son observaciones basadas en el análisis de los hallazgos recurrentes, deben de ser generales para poder ser aplicadas bajo otros contextos.</p>
50 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.	No		
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>Las recomendaciones no se encuentran priorizadas, dirigidas hacia una partes interesada en específico y algunas de ellas no son accionables y realistas. Sin embargo, en su mayoría son relevantes para el propósito y objetivos de la evaluación.</p>		
			<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></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>
Style and presentation				
51. 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	Yes	Las primeras secciones del reporte contienen suficiente información para ubicar al lector. La estructura es coherente y las secciones se encuentran en una posición adecuada para tener una buena legibilidad. La única sección que se encuentra desplazada es aquella de Lecciones Aprendidas. Los anexos no fueron disponibles para el revisor.	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.	
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes			
53 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	N/A			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	N/A			
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	El resumen ejecutivo contiene un resumen de todos los elementos incluidos en el programa sin embargo, es excesivamente largo (18 páginas) lo que diezma su capacidad para ser una herramienta efectiva en la toma de decisiones.	Highly satisfactory	El resumen ejecutivo no debe ser más largo que tres páginas.
56 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	Yes			
57 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	Yes			
58 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.	No			
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>	La estructura del reporte es adecuada y permite una buena legibilidad. El resumen ejecutivo es demasiado largo (18 páginas) lo que diezma su capacidad de ser una buena herramienta que ayude a la decisión.			
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	En general, podemos decir que los evaluadores respondieron a las exigencias de los TDR sin embargo el criterio de impacto no fue abordado.			
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	sin comentario			
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	sin comentario			
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?	Mostly	La calidad entre las diferentes secciones varia de gran manera. Las primeras en dónde se introduce el objeto evaluado son claras mientras que aquellas en donde se reportan los resultados presentan varias omisiones. Por lo que dependiendo la sección si esta da o no confianza para actuar.	Mostly Satisfactory La exposición del objeto evaluado, así como su propósito, objetivos y alcance se encuentran bien definidos. Las debilidades del reporte se muestran a partir del reporte de los resultados. Los hallazgos son difíciles de encontrar, mientras que las conclusiones no muestran el análisis a profundidad que debería provenir de ellos. Las recomendaciones aunque abordan principalmente los elementos débiles del programa no son accionables en su totalidad, no son priorizadas y no se encuentran dirigidas a una parte interesada en específico. Las lecciones aprendidas que se integraron, no destilan conocimiento generado a partir de la evidencia para contribuir a otros proyectos bajo otro contexto. El resumen ejecutivo que se presenta es muy extenso lo que no es idóneo para una herramienta de toma de decisiones.
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 appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Mostly	La estructuración de las secciones es lógica sin embargo las debilidades de la sección donde se reportan los resultados afecta la integridad del reporte.	
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.	ToRs	sin comentario	
	Other	sin comentario	
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>	Las debilidades que presenta esta evaluación se encuentran sobre todo en el reporte de los resultados. Aunque el documento tiene un buen inicio donde el objetos evaluados y los parametros para hacerlo son bien presentados la información que reporta los hallazgos, conclusiones y recomendaciones presentan importantes debilidades en cuanto a su formulación.		