

EVALUATION ID 2450-2015-001

**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

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)      [UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)      [UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

Response	
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Evaluation of the 'School Without Violence' Programme</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2015-001 <b>Date of Review</b> 14-12-2015 <b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b> 2015
<b>Region</b>	Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO <b>Country</b> Republic of Kyrgyzstan
<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> )	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.
<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) 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> )	5.6 Child Protection: Supporting global efforts to prevent violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect through improved and equitable prevention and child protection systems. Programme areas: a) Child protection systems strengthening b) Violence, exploitation and abuse c) Justice for children d) Birth registration e) Strengthened families and communities f) Child protection 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>					
<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.	Yes	The object of the evaluation is generally well described. The description of the programme includes the broader framework, the objectives, the programme implementation (including the number of people reached), and stakeholders. The context is briefly described and directly related to the object of the evaluation (p. 13). Government and agency (e.g. UNICEF) policies and frameworks within which the programme is framed are described in this section. The context description, which is very brief, does not shed any particular light on the findings of the evaluation.	<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 & priorities, as appropriate.		
<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 & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes				
<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.	Mostly				
<b>Theory of Change</b>					
<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.	No	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	The report presents a generally clear and full description of the object of the evaluation. The programme's theory of change is however missing. While UNICEF's role/contribution is clear, the contextual description of UNICEF's goals, priorities, and strategies in Kyrgyzstan is only briefly mentioned.		
<b>Stakeholders and their contributions</b>					
<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	Yes			Key stakeholders, including UNICEF, are clearly identified as are their respective contributions to the programme in terms of their responsibilities (pp. 16-17).	Evaluation reports should provide a detailed - and critical - assessment of the programme's theory of change.
<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	Yes				
<b>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes				
<b>Implementation Status</b>					
<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	Yes			The programme's implementation status is well described and includes significant changes that have occurred to plans and strategies, as well as the progressive expansion of the programme's reach (pp. 14-16).	
<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The object of the evaluation, its context, key stakeholders and implementation status are well described, but the programme theory of change and a critical assessment of its expected results are missing.</b>				

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 statement is generally clear and appears to have been taken from the evaluation ToR (p. 17). The objectives of the evaluation are also generally clear and relate to the purpose (p. 17). The scope of the evaluation is however not clearly described. Evaluation questions are presented in relation to the findings for each criterion at the beginning of each relevant section.	<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>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		
<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>	Yes	The report provides a relevant list of the criteria used for this evaluation (p. 20). The criteria are identified as OECD/DAC criteria and briefly defined. However, no evaluation matrix is included in the report.	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>
<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.	Yes		
<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 evaluation's purpose, objectives, and criteria are well presented and explanations provided are sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation. The evaluation scope was not sufficiently described.</b>		
		<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	

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>	Mostly	<p>The report specifies data collection, analysis, and sampling methods but benchmarks are not clearly specified (pp. 22-25). Data collection tools are provided in annex (Annex III). The report also presents the evaluation approach (p. 21) and correctly identifies the evaluation design as non-experimental (p. 22).</p>	<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. 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		
<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	<p>Ethical issues and considerations related both to the programme and evaluation designs are described (pp. 25-26). The report refers to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described. An Ethical Protocol was designed based on the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note. (p. 25, Annex II).</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<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		
<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>	Mostly	<p>The capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system are assessed to a certain extent (pp. 18, 43, 60) but, as mentioned above, the programme's theory of change is not presented. It is not clear what are the short-term vs. longer term expected results of the programme. The evaluation makes appropriate use of the programme's M&amp;E framework to a certain extent by assessing the programme's effectiveness in relation to the programme's objectives (pp. 32-55, 60-64).</p>	<p>The methodology used to conduct this evaluation is appropriate and sound, allows for the protection of child participants, the triangulation of data, and for yielding answers to the evaluation questions. However, a more robust analysis of the evaluated object's monitoring system and evaluation framework should have been provided.</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>	Mostly		

**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.

Yes

The evaluation design and style considered incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity (pp. 21, 26, 30-31). It assesses the extent to which the implementation of the programme was monitored through human rights framework, the focus of the programme being the right of children to protection from violence in schools (pp. 30-31). The extent to which gender was considered in the programme's monitoring processes is however less clear from the evaluation. Much of the survey data presented throughout the findings is sex-disaggregated.

**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.

Yes

**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.

Yes

**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.

Yes

**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.

Yes

Highly satisfactory

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>	Yes	The levels and activities of stakeholder consultation are described and levels of participation are appropriate for the task at hand (pp. 27-28).
<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>	Yes	
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>	N/A	The report mentions that a counterfactual, while initially planned, was not constructed "at the request of UNICEF because of budget constraints." (p. 28). The methodology facilitates answers to the evaluation questions in the context of this evaluation. Methodological limitations are identified and are acceptable for the task at hand (pp. 18-19, 28-29).
<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>	Yes	
<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	
<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>The report provides a good description of data collection, analysis, and sampling methods as well as stakeholder involvement. Human rights and ethical considerations are also clearly addressed. Data collection tools are provided in annex.</b></p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>				
<p><b>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</b></p> <p>Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.</p>	Mostly	<p>The findings are not easily distinguishable from the evidence, but overall, the report appears to be based on the objective use of the reported evidence. An effort has been made to clarify another similar programme implemented in one of the sample target schools of the SWV programme and to distinguish between results attributable to each. (p. 62). However, there are some quotes throughout the findings with some sources mentioned that could potentially be easily identified which raises questions with respect to the confidentiality of evaluation participants (e.g. p. 36). Process achievements are distinguished from results although the distinction between programme outputs and outcomes is not always clear. The findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions. They demonstrate some progression to results by addressing the five programme objectives. Gaps and limitations are discussed (pp. 28-29), but they are not clearly linked to the impossibility of answering specific evaluation questions. There does not seem to be any unexpected finding.</p>	<p><b>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b></p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</b></p> <p>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</b></p> <p>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</p>	Mostly			
<p><b>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</b></p> <p>The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.</p>	Mostly			
<p><b>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</b></p> <p>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</p>	N/A			
<b>Cost Analysis</b>				
<p><b>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</b></p> <p>Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.</p>	No	<p>The findings are not clearly identifiable, but the information presented throughout the body of the report appears to be based on evidence and a sound analysis. The efficiency section of the report is quite short and does not include sufficient information to provide a thorough analysis. While conclusions seem to reflect stakeholders' views, they could have been expanded to better reflect all evaluation criteria assessed and ensure their relevance to end users of the evaluation.</p>	<p>Citations should be used sparingly and in such a way as to ensure the full protection of the identity of the person cited. If possible, efficiency should also be assessed more thoroughly.</p>	

Contribution and causality		
<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 evaluation makes a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders. While causal reasons for accomplishments and failures are identified, there is limited discussion of whether some results could be attributed to other similar programmes being implemented in the sampled schools.
<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>	Mostly	
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>	Mostly	The future implications of continuing constraints are discussed primarily in the findings related to the sustainability of the programme (pp. 57-59). The findings present both strengths and weaknesses of the programme, and the conclusions provides a balanced summary of the strengths and weaknesses.
<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	
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>	Mostly	The Conclusions summarizes the main issues identified in the report. They do not fully reflect the findings with respect to each of the evaluation criteria as there appear to be two conclusions related to programme relevance, two related to programme effectiveness, and one related to programme sustainability. Conclusions related to programme efficiency and impact appear to have been overlooked. The conclusions do not explicitly refer to stakeholders views, but these seem to be reflected. Given the limited information provided in the conclusions, it is unlikely that they will be completely relevant to the end users of the evaluation.
<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	
<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>	Mostly	
<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 section presents information based on evidence and data collected. Clear finding statements are however absents. Conclusions are too brief and do not cover each of the evaluation criteria as no conclusions are identified for programme efficiency and impact. They are therefore not entirely relevant to the end users of this evaluation.</b></p>	

Mostly Satisfactory

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.	Mostly	The recommendations are derived from the evidence reported and are relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation but there is no cross-reference to findings to help the reader link recommendations to findings. Recommendations also tend to be quite general therefore not easily "actionable" (pp. 67-69). There are 15 recommendations and they are not prioritized.	<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>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Mostly		
<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.	No		
<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	Each recommendation identifies a target group for action (pp. 67-69). While the report mentions the recommendations "design" was "shared with a range of stakeholders", it also mentions "the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ombudsman and the Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights" stakeholders were not involved in this due to early May celebrations in the country (p. 28).	<b>Mostly Satisfactory</b>
<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	Mostly		
<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.	Yes		
<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.	No	Five lessons learned are identified in the report. They are brief and most are directly linked to the context in Kyrgyzstan, which indicates little wider relevance outside of the evaluated object. They tend to be worded like recommendations as opposed to lessons learned.	
<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		
<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 appear to be somewhat relevant and derived from the reported evidence but they are generally worded and not immediately "actionable". Lessons learned tend to be worded like recommendations, and do not all indicate wider applicability.</b>		

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

Recommendations should be specific and "actionable" and a timeframe for their implementation should be indicated. Lessons learned should contribute to general knowledge and be formulated in a different way than recommendations.

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 contain most of the basic elements. The timeframe of the programme covered by the evaluation is however missing. The report is generally logically structured. The annexes contain appropriate elements but do not include the evaluation matrix.	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	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	Overall, the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report.		
<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			
<b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes			
<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	The executive summary contains all the necessary elements. Overall, it can stand alone and inform decision making. It is however a bit long (i.e. 5 pages).	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	The timeframe covered by the evaluation should be mentioned in the opening pages of the report. The annexes should include the evaluation matrix.
<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			
<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			
<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.	Mostly			
<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 reads fairly well, is focused, and contains most of the key elements in the opening pages, executive summary, and annexes. The evaluation matrix should however be included as an annex to further increase the usefulness and credibility of the report.</b>			
<b>Additional Information</b>				
Question	Remarks			
<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	The evaluation report addresses most of the ToR requirements.			
<b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation	This report indicates good practice in its description of a detailed and sound methodology.			
<b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	This report identifies one aspect of good practice related to the effectiveness of broaching the topic of violence with children through "open and unstructured discussions, artistic work (drawing, painting, singing) rather than structured and standardised yes/no questions." (p. 35)			

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: $\Omega$ / 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.
<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?	Mostly	The first sections of the evaluation report are well done and provide useful information. However, the findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned do contain lacunae that may decrease credibility to give a person confidence to act.	Mostly Satisfactory
<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'.	Yes	The six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report.	
<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.	ToRs		
	Other		
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>While the report presents clear evaluation objectives and criteria and a detailed and sound methodology, there is still room for improvement in the presentations of the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. Moreover, while being based on evidence, the findings could be made more distinguishable from the evidence and the programme's theory of change should be presented and explained.</b>		