

EVALUATION ID	2070-2014/002
---------------	---------------

**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 Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

<a href="#">UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</a>
--	--	---

Response	
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Education Sector Response to HIV &amp; AIDS</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2014/002
<b>Date of Review</b>	March 24, 2015
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2014
<b>Region</b>	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office
<b>Country</b>	Indonesia
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation
<b>TORs Present</b>	Yes
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	<b>Universalia Management Group</b>
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
<b>Geographic Scope</b> ( <i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; 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
<b>Management of Evaluation</b> ( <i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i> )	2.3 Joint managed, with organisations outside the UN system: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more organizations outside the UN system
<b>Purpose</b> ( <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
<b>Result</b> ( <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
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> ( <i>Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action</i> )	5.2 HIV-AIDS: Supporting global efforts to prevent new HIV infections and increase treatment during both decades of a child's life through improved and equitable use of proven HIV prevention and treatment interventions by pregnant women, children and adolescents. Programme areas: a) Prevention of mother to child transmission and infant male circumcision b) Care and treatment of young children affected by HIV&AIDS c) Adolescents and HIV&AIDS d) Protection and support for children and families e) HIV-AIDS in humanitarian situations
<b>Level of Independence</b> ( <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.
<b>Approach</b>	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		
<b>Object and context</b>				
<p><b>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</b> 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.</p>	Mostly	<p>The object of the evaluation is reasonably well defined. The evaluators use the program's logic model to describe the intervention. This approach leaves some ambiguity in terms of what actual intervention activities took place. Program theory does not always match the intervention on the ground. For example, the 5 strategies on p. 18 are too general to provide a clear enough understanding of the intervention.</p> <p>The context of the program is explained in detail in section 3.1, p. 15-17 and covers social, political, economic, demographic and institutional factors. The evaluators provide a contextual summary of education and youth which helps bridge the intervention with the identified problem.</p> <p>The context is linked to the findings.</p>	<p><b>A/ Does the report present a clear &amp; full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b> 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 &amp; priorities, as appropriate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>	
<p><b>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</b> 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 &amp; priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level</p>	Yes			
<p><b>3 Does this illuminate findings?</b> The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</p>	Yes			
<b>Theory of Change</b>				
<p><b>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b> 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.</p>	Yes	<p>The theory of change is presented through a "Programme Results Chain" on p.19.</p>	<p>The description of the object was reasonably well done without including a fully sufficient level of detail.</p> <p>The context of the intervention is well described and helps the reader to understand the education and youth landscape.</p> <p>The theory of change is described and also presented in a "Programme Results Chain".</p> <p>Stakeholders and their various roles and contributions are explicitly addressed in a clear and transparent manner. The implementation status is described as being complete.</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Highly satisfactory</b></p> <p>To improve the clarity of the description of the object the evaluators could have included more specific detail for each strategy listed on p. 18.</p>	
<b>Stakeholders and their contributions</b>				
<p><b>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</b> These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers</p>	Yes	<p>Primary and secondary stakeholders are described on p. 21 - 22. These include implementation and development partners as well as beneficiaries. The evaluation does not employ the term 'duty bearer.'</p>		
<p><b>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?</b> 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</p>	Yes	<p>The contributions of key stakeholders are described in section 3.5.</p> <p>UNICEF contributions are described p. 22.</p>		
<p><b>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	Yes			
<b>Implementation Status</b>				
<p><b>8 Is the implementation status described?</b> 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</p>	Yes	<p>The implementation status is explicitly described in excellent detail on p. 24.</p>		

**Executive Feedback on Section A**

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

*Up to two sentences*

**The overall strategies of the project are clear, but the activities undertaken by the project are not. Context is well described. The logic model is used well to illustrate the theory of change. Stakeholders are clearly identified.**

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Purpose, objectives and scope</b>					
<b>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</b> This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The evaluation purpose is presented clearly and concisely. It explains who needs the information and how it will be used. Primary users are explicitly mentioned p. 25.	<b>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>  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.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
<b>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b> 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	Mostly	The evaluation objectives are clear and tangible p.24-25. The scope section does not clearly identify what will and will not be covered.  The objectives and scope relate back to the purpose of the evaluation.			
<b>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</b> 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				
<b>Evaluation framework</b>					
<b>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</b> 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>	Mostly	The evaluation makes use of the standard OECD/DAC criteria. The evaluators provide an evaluation framework which visually describes the relationship between evaluation activities and purpose.  The authors do not explicitly discuss the evaluation criteria.	<b>Mostly Satisfactory</b>	The evaluation purpose, objectives and scope are sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation. The scope section is missing key information. Some of this information can be found in the challenges and limitations section.  The evaluators present a useful evaluation framework. Lacking is explicit presentation and discussion of the evaluation criteria.	The scope section should address more explicitly the boundaries of what will and will not be assessed.  The evaluators should explicitly present and discuss the evaluation criteria.
<b>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</b> 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.	No				
<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are clearly presented and tangible. They provide a solid foundation for the evaluation. An evaluation framework is present. Lacking is the explicit presentation of the evaluation criteria and justification for their use. The scope section is missing key information.</b>				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Data collection</b>			
<p><b>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</b> This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	Sampling and data collection methods are described adequately in section 5.1. The approach includes a quantitative survey, qualitative capacity assessment and qualitative survey of schools and communities. Detailed descriptions of methodology, analysis, rationale for selection of methods, and their limitations for the approaches and methodologies are outlined in the annexes.	<p><b>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</b></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.</p> <p>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><b>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</b> This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits</p>	Yes	Section 5.1 provides a rationale for the selection of data sources. Table 1 on p. 33 provides a breakdown of informants used for the evaluation.	
<b>Ethics</b>			
<p><b>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b> 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>	Yes	Ethical issues are considered and described. The evaluation describes itself as guided by a set of ethical principles covering a wide range of issues p.33.	
<p><b>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</b> 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>	Yes	Ethical safeguards are described explicitly and in detail in section 5.3. These go beyond listing guidance documents and describes ethical protocols followed during the course of the evaluation.	
<b>Results Based Management</b>			
<p><b>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</b> The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&amp;E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	Yes	The evaluation uses two baseline reports commissioned by UNICEF at the beginning of the program as a foundation for the evaluation. The capacity of these instruments is discussed in the limitations section on p. 27-28. The authors note poor M&E practices: "Lack of strong, systematic program monitoring and evaluation compromised potential effectiveness by impeding prompt identification of program delivery issues and appropriate solutions" p.67.	<p>The methodology of the evaluation is appropriate and sound.</p> <p>Data collection methods are clearly presented along with a rationale for their use.</p> <p>The report uses its own ethical framework which is presents in section 5.3.</p> <p>The evaluation builds on a baseline survey conducted at the project's beginning to assess change over time. It also makes appropriate use of the evaluation matrix provided in the TOR.</p>
<p><b>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</b> 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>	Yes	The evaluation uses the evaluation matrix provided in the TOR.	
			<p>The report could be improved with more explicit considerations of human rights, gender and equity issues within the methodology.</p> <p>The contributions of stakeholders to the evaluation design and implementation should be addressed more explicitly.</p>
			<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>

**Human Rights, Gender and Equity**

**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?**

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. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority. To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.

No

The evaluation design and style does not incorporate the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity.

**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?**

UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.

No

The evaluation does not assess the extent to which the implementation was monitored through a human rights framework.

**22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?**

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. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.

No

The methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons do not provide appropriate information on human rights.

**23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?**

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.

Mostly

The evaluation assesses gender equity in its findings, conclusions and lesson learned. It also breaks down its information by gender (including a column for transgender.) Gender is not mentioned in the methodology.

Highly satisfactory

The contribution of stakeholders to the evaluation is not clear, beyond their role as informants.

Overall the methodology is robust and the report is credible. It facilitates answers to the evaluations and its limitations are acceptable.

**24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?**

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.

Mostly

The evaluators assess the implementation's alignment with UNICEF's equity agenda p.43. The evaluation also uses Equity as a core criteria which is analysed in the findings, section 6.4 p.71. Equity considerations are therefore present in the analytical framework, findings and conclusions.

Stakeholder participation		
<p><b>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</b> 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	The levels and activities of stakeholders in the evaluation are not explicitly described, other than their role as informants.
<p><b>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</b> The breadth &amp; 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 &amp; preferable.</p>	Mostly	Stakeholders participate as informants. Their role in developing the evaluation design, conclusions and recommendations are unknown.
Methodological robustness		
<p><b>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution?</b> 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	It is not apparent from the report that the evaluation methodology attempted to address contribution/ attribution issues.
<p><b>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</b> The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Mostly	The methodology facilitates answers to the survey questions. However, limitations in actual data collection meant that some questions could not be addressed in a highly satisfactory manner.
<p><b>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</b> 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	The evaluation reports limitations with regard to methodology. However these limitations are acceptable. The primary issue is too few surveys to allow for the valid analysis of sub-groups. They also note that some changes were made to the survey instrument since the baseline assessment.
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>Overall the methodology supporting the evaluation is thorough and robust and facilitates answers to the evaluation questions. Methodological limitations are addressed and are within reason. Considerations of human rights, gender and equity issues are not discussed in the methodology but are included within the analysis and conclusions.</b></p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>			
<b>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</b> Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Yes	Findings are clearly presented and based on the objective use of evidence. Activities are differentiated from results. Findings do not appear biased as evidenced from the balance of positive and negative which is presented.	<b>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</b> 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.
<b>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</b> The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes	The findings address all evaluation questions in a systematic manner. The findings are grouped by evaluation criteria. Within the criteria the findings are grouped under the 19 key evaluation questions. Some questions cannot be answered quantitatively but regardless they are addressed.	
<b>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</b> There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes	The author's use of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative is well marshaled to demonstrate support for findings.	
<b>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</b> 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	Gaps and limitations are discussed. For example, the authors recognize that the sample size of sexually active adolescents is too small to be useful. Where data is insufficient the authors are not afraid to address the gap.  The use of anecdotal 'stories of change' are an effective tool to demonstrate findings that run counter to the quantitative data or reveal <u>unexpected findings</u> .	
<b>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</b> If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	Yes		
<b>Cost Analysis</b>			
<b>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</b> 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.	Mostly	A cost analysis was not conducted. See limitations p. 27. "Mostly satisfactory" reflects the fact that the gap was addressed in the Limitations and not ignored.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
			This section was well done and there are no recommendations for change.
			The findings and conclusions are presented clearly. They are relevant and based on evidence gathered. The analysis is sound.  The findings are presented in a systematic manner. Where data was insufficient to address a particular questions the authors address the gap explicitly. This increases transparency and credibility.  The use of 'stories of change' is engaging. It helps to connect the reader with the informants and helps contextualize the findings. They are also used where quantitative gaps existed to offer alternative (if only anecdotal) explanations for outcomes.  A cost analysis was not conducted. This is attributed to lack of data from the program p. 27.  Contribution for results is reasonably addressed given resource constraints. Findings and conclusions are not grandiose in pronouncements of attributed results.  Ongoing / future weaknesses are addressed in the conclusion. Overall the conclusions appear unbiased and offer both strengths and weaknesses.

Contribution and causality		Highly satisfactory	Conclusions are insightful and the analysis appears credible. The language and presentation of the conclusions is professional and of an appropriate level for the intended audience.	
<p><b>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</b> For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Yes			The evaluators make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to specific stakeholders. For example, linking outcomes to specific pilot schools. They also make use of informant interview to make links between outcomes and their sources.
<p><b>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</b> 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			Causal reasons for success and failure are identified. The authors also attempt to explain where survey issues may be skewing data so as to avoid any bogus conclusions.
Strengths, weaknesses and implications				
<p><b>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</b> 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 authors note that the program logic relied heavily on government partnerships and this did not manifest as positively as desired. For example the functionality of the Education Sector Pokja for mainstreaming HIV in education p. 66. Lessons Learned, section 7.1 focus on future implications and constraints for the program, p. 72-76.
<p><b>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</b> 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			Conclusions present both strengths and weaknesses.
Completeness and insight of conclusions				
<p><b>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</b> 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>	Yes			Conclusions are insightful and add value to the findings. They go beyond the findings to identify important underlying problems and opportunities.
<p><b>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</b> 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	Conclusions are based on findings which take into account a wide range of stakeholders. Therefore it is assumed that the conclusions take into account a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.		
<p><b>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</b> 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	The conclusions are presented in a language and format that is relevant for the end users of the evaluation. The authors use plain language (jargon free) and write in a professional and compelling fashion.		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The findings are presented systematically. They appear objective and are based on evidence. Quantitative data is presented in a transparent manner which increases transparency and credibility. Qualitative 'stories of change' help to contextualize findings and bring the reader closer to 'the ground'. Conclusions are insightful and presented at an appropriate level for the intended audience.</b></p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</b>				
<b>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</b> Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are well grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported.	<b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> 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.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation.		
<b>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</b> 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.	Mostly	Recommendations are clearly stated. They are not prioritized. Given that the recommendations are grouped under three target groups the lack of prioritization is not critical.		
<b>Usefulness of recommendations</b>				
<b>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</b> 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.	Yes	Recommendations are listed under the heading of the target group identified for action. E.g. UNICEF, Joint recommendations for UNICEF and Government and Education Departments of Papua and West Papua.	<b>Mostly Satisfactory</b>	The recommendations and lessons learned are relevant and actionable.  Both sections are supported by evidence and are insightful, relating back to the object and the purpose.  Recommendations are targeted at specific groups for action. They are not prioritized. It is not clear how stakeholders were involved in their development.  Lessons learned are relevant and insightful. They are presented with too much specificity to the object of the evaluation rather than being generalized for application to a wider context.
<b>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</b> This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Yes	The recommendations are realistic in the context of the evaluation.		
<b>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</b> 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	The report describes a 'phase 3' where a draft report is presented to stakeholders for feedback. The TOR mention the presentation of findings and lessons learned but not recommendations, p. 95.		
<b>Appropriate lessons learned</b>				
<b>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</b> 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.	Mostly	Lesson learned are correctly identified, section 7.1 p.72-76. The only issue is that they are overly specific to the object being evaluated. In this sense they are similar to conclusions.		Given the number of lessons learned the authors could improve the section by focusing on more general lessons and discuss them in a more general context that would be applicable to a wider array of potential programs.
<b>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</b> Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	Mostly	Some lessons learned are properly generalized while others are overly specific.		The authors should provide prioritization of the recommendations.  The role of stakeholders in the development of recommendations should be explicit in the report.
<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The recommendations are insightful, relevant and actionable. They are targeted at those responsible for taking action although they are not prioritized. The role of stakeholders in their development is unknown. Lessons learned are relevant and insightful but overly specific to the object, rendering them more like conclusions.</b>			

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>
<b>Style and presentation</b>				
<b>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</b> 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	The opening pages of the evaluation contain all the basic elements.	Highly satisfactory	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.
<b>52 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	The report is logically structured. The sequencing is appropriate.		
<b>53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</b> Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes	The annexes contain the appropriate elements. They contain: Revised TOR, detailed methodology of capacity and qualitative assessments and data quality assurance systems.		
<b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes	The annexes increase the credibility and usefulness of the evaluation.		
<b>Executive Summary</b>				
<b>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</b> If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	An executive summary is included as part of the report p. 1-14.	Highly satisfactory	The executive summary is well done but lengthy. It could be shortened by summarizing findings more succinctly or adding value to the reader by filtering for the most critical findings.
<b>56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</b> 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	The executive summary contains all the necessary elements including an overview of the evaluated object (p.1); Evaluation objectives and intended audience and methodology (p. 2-3); Findings (p. 3-10) and conclusions (p. 10-12); Main recommendations (p. 13-14) and Lesson Learned (p. 12-13).		
<b>57 Can the executive summary stand alone?</b> It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Yes	The executive summary can stand alone.		
<b>58 Can the executive summary inform decision making?</b> It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Yes	The executive summary can inform decision making.		
<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The report is complete and well structured with a professional style and presentation. The annexes serve as a useful reference to the reader and create transparency. The executive summary, although overly long, can stand alone and inform decision making.</b>			
<b>Additional Information</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Remarks</b>			

<p><b>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</b> 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</p>	The evaluation successfully addresses the TOR.		
<p><b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation</p>	In the findings, where the data collection process rendered insufficient data, the evaluators included the corresponding questions and indicators and noted the gap. This increases transparency and credibility by giving the impression that the authors did not gloss over data issues.		
<p><b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>			
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			
<p><b>Question</b></p>	<p><b>cc</b></p>	<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>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?</b> This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p>
<p><b>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</b> 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The report should provide a reasonable person with the confidence to act. The object is described although somewhat generally. The same is true for the methodology and criteria. Overall the approach to addressing the evaluation questions is rigorous and sound. Good use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Findings are approached systematically and based in evidence. Conclusions are insightful and add value to the findings. Lessons learned are insightful although more similar to conclusion in their specificity. Recommendations are relevant and actionable</p>	<p><b>Highly satisfactory</b></p> <p>This is a highly satisfactory report that would give a reasonable user the confidence to act on its findings and recommendations.</p> <p>This is a highly satisfactory report that would give a reasonable user the confidence to act on its findings and recommendations.</p> <p>The authors provide a clear picture of the evaluated object and the implementation context. A logic model is used to articulate how activities were intended manifest outcomes.</p> <p>The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are clearly presented as are key stakeholders.</p> <p>The methodology supporting the evaluation is thorough and robust. The evaluators appear comfortable acknowledging limitations.</p> <p>The findings are presented in a systematic manner which allows the reader to apply them to the evaluation criteria. Conclusions are insightful, unbiased and are not simply repetitions of the findings.</p> <p>Recommendations are relevant and actionable. They are targeted but not prioritized.</p>
<p><b>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</b> The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The entire reports holds together as a logical whole with common threads throughout.</p>	
<p><b>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</b> This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p>	<p>ToRs</p>		
	<p>Other</p>		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>This is a strong evaluation with a robust methodological approach and insightful findings. The approach to addressing the evaluation questions is rigorous and sound. The findings, which were approached systematically, appear based in evidence and the conclusions add value. There are areas of the report such as the description of the object, methodology and criteria where more detail would have increased the tangibility. Overall, an excellent evaluation.</b></p>		