

EVALUATION ID 2660-2014/007

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	
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of the Early Childhood Development Programme in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Report sequence number	2014/007 Date of Review 02/04/2015 Year of the Evaluation Report 2015
Region	Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO Country Macedonia
Type of Report	Evaluation TORs Present No
Name of reviewer	Universalia Management Group
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
Geographic Scope (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>)	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.
Management of Evaluation (<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.
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.3 Impact: Final results of a programme or policy on the intended beneficiaries and, where possible, on comparison groups. Reflects the cumulative effect of donor supported programmes of cooperation and national policy initiatives.
SPOA Correspondence (<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>)	5.5 Education: Supporting global efforts to provide access to quality education for both boys and girls through improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education. Programme areas: a) Early learning b) Equity with a focus on girls' education and inclusive education c) Learning and child friendly schools d) Education in humanitarian situations
Level of Independence (<i>Implementation and control of the evaluation activities</i>)	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.
Approach	7.3 Summative and formative: An evaluation that combines the elements of a formative and a summative evaluation.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Object and context				
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	The object of the evaluation is very well described as is the country context. Descriptions are straightforward and cover all essential elements (pp. 1-6). The context sheds light on the findings.	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.	
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes			
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes			
Theory of Change				
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Outstanding	The programme theory of change (TOC) is very well articulated at a macro level as befits a sectoral programme: inputs, ELSR interventions thematically organized according to UNICEF core roles, outcome-level results framed as system changes, and impacts on primary beneficiaries (pre-school children) from a child rights perspective (pp. 4-6).	The report presents a clear graphic and narrative description of the programme's underlying TOC. Key sectoral, economic, sociocultural, political, and institutional factors related to the object of the evaluation are briefly but effectively discussed (pp. 2-3).	
Stakeholders and their contributions				
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes			
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Yes			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Outstanding	Highly satisfactory	Presenting the programme TOC in both graphic and narrative form reflects good practice in evaluation reporting.	
Implementation Status				

<p>8 Is the implementation status described?</p> <p>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>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The implementation status of the programme, including key changes over the implementation period (e.g. retro-fitting of UNICEF programming and ELSR system changes onto the recent adoption of the MoRES and UNICEF core roles in the TOC), are well described (pp. 1, 3-6).</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section A</p> <p>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.</p> <p><i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The report's introduction includes good contextual and TOC analysis of the object of the evaluation that effectively sets the stage for an in-depth assessment of the programme's contribution to achieving impact-level results through system changes. Key stakeholder roles are briefly discussed.</p>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Purpose, objectives and scope				
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The purpose and specific objectives of the evaluation are clearly presented (p. 1). The scope of the evaluation is briefly indicated as covering the period 2005-2012 (p. 1). This evaluation being an in-depth case study of a multi-country evaluation (MCE) conducted the previous year, the geographical scope is the same as that covered in the MCE, although the areas covered could have been recapitulated in this report (p. 7). The objectives and scope relate to the purpose of the evaluation.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Mostly			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes			
Evaluation framework				
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Mostly	The report does not list the evaluation criteria used per se but these are indicated in the table of contents and sub-headings under which the findings are organized (sections 4.1-4.5). They are the standard OECD-DAC criteria. Evaluation questions in relation to each criterion are not outlined (except in the TOR in annex) nor is an evaluation matrix provided in annex.	Mostly Satisfactory The evaluation purpose and objectives are clearly presented while the scope for this in-depth country study is obliquely mentioned in reference to the multi-country evaluation conducted the previous year of which this report is an offshoot. The evaluation criteria are not listed in chapters 1 and 2 but are clearly presented in the findings chapter (Ch. 4) and in the TOR in appendix. The report makes frequent reference to the MCE conducted the previous year which presumably provided more detailed information on the evaluation framework for the Macedonia component. Reference is made to Appendix 2 for a full list of consultations (p. 7) but this appendix does not provide context on the municipalities selected for consultation and schools visited.	While the evaluation purpose and objectives are clear, the report would have benefited from additional recapitulation of the parameters of the MCE that apply to the in-depth ECD programme under review, such as information on geographical coverage for the primary sources of data collection. It is also good practice to outline the evaluation criteria and concomitant questions in this section of the report.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Mostly			
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The purpose and specific objectives of the evaluation are clearly described. However, the scope lacks clarity in terms of the geographical areas of sub-national stakeholder consultations and the preschool facilities visited in the context of the MCE and upon which the findings of the present evaluation are based.			

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Data collection			
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	<p>The report summarizes data collection and analysis methods, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations (pp. 6-8). The report mentions that the MCE-related methodology was supplemented by new documentation made available since the MCE (p. 7) but does not identify these data sources, nor is a bibliography included in annex.</p>	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>
<p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p>	Mostly		
Ethics			
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	No	<p>Ethical issues and safeguards are not addressed in the context of this evaluation.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	No		
Results Based Management			
<p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	Yes	<p>The report identifies M&E as a core role of UNICEF in the programme TOC (pp. 4-5) and highlights UNICEF achievements in fulfilling that role (p. 28). It also highlights the importance of ELDS (quality standards/benchmarks) for monitoring child outcomes (p. 26). The MoRES determinant analysis framework is used by the evaluation in accordance with UNICEF norms to assess system changes (p. 4).</p>	<p>The methodology used in the context of this evaluation is appropriate and sound. Methodological choices are made explicit and justified and limitations noted.</p>
<p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	Yes		

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.

Outstanding

Human rights, gender, and equity are integrated in the evaluation design as cross-cutting themes. One of the three specific objectives of the evaluation is to "Document and report on impact results (in terms of changes in children's life) and reduction of equity gaps in ELSR." (p. 1) As a key focus of this evaluation, child rights, gender and equity dimensions are addressed throughout the report. Child rights and equity considerations particularly stand out from the presentation of the context (pp. 1-3) and

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.

Outstanding

TOC with ELSR system determinants/ UNICEF core roles related to ELSR (pp. 4-6) through the methodology (e.g. interviews with both male and female teachers and parents as well as parents of children with disabilities (p. 7) to the findings (pp. 10-18, 27, 32 especially), conclusions (pp. 33-34, 36-37), and recommendations (pp. 38-39).

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.

Outstanding

Gender equality issues are addressed throughout the findings but are not explicitly mentioned in the conclusions, lessons, and recommendations.

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.

Outstanding

Highly satisfactory

Stakeholder participation		
<p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	Yes	Stakeholder consultations are described (pp. 6-7) and individual persons interviewed are listed in Appendix 2. The rationale for this level of participation is provided. The levels of participation are appropriate in the context of this evaluation.
<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p>	Yes	
Methodological robustness		
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	No	While the report provides net enrolment figures for kindergartens that exclude UNICEF-supported ECDCs (p. 13) and information from the UNICEF outcomes study comparing children's outcomes in project kindergartens and non-project kindergartens (p. 15), the report does not otherwise draw comparisons with non-UNICEF-funded projects. A counterfactual was not attempted for primary sources of data. The methodology is appropriate in the context of this evaluation. Limitations are identified (p. 7) and are acceptable for the task at hand.
<p>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes	
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Yes	
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The methodology used in the context of this evaluation is appropriate and sound and the methodological limitations identified are acceptable. The methodology effectively addresses results-based management, human rights, gender equality, and equity issues.</p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Mostly	Findings are very clearly presented and effectively distinguish between inputs and results, demonstrating the progression to results based on the evidence reported, such as the finding that UNICEF "has been strategic in both its analysis and programming, with multiple, intersecting initiatives simultaneously to gradually address different system determinants and build a strong foundation for the expansion of the sector." (p. 9). While documentary sources from which evidence is derived are often specified in both the main narrative and footnotes, primary sources of data from which some findings are derived are not specified, resulting in an unclear evidence base. That said, the findings address all of the evaluation criteria and gaps/limitations are discussed (e.g. pp. 10, 19). No unusual or unexpected findings are highlighted in this report.	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes			
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes			
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	No			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	N/A	While the report addresses UNICEF-supported ECDC costs, these could not be compared with costs related to government-funded kindergartens. The report states, "Data are not available to separate specific preschool budget allocations and expenditures from broader MLSP budgets, so it is not possible to examine trends over the evaluation period." (p. 19). Findings with respect to the efficiency criterion illustrate an attempt to break down UNICEF programming costs by UNICEF core roles but this analysis is tempered by caveats related to the interpretation of data (pp. 30-31).		

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Yes	<p>The report makes a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to the key stakeholder of this report, i.e. UNICEF, in accordance with the evaluation's focus "on a <i>contribution analysis</i> of the part UNICEF interventions played in the processes and influences that led to the system changes identified." (p. 1) Causal reasons for accomplishments and failures are identified throughout the findings.</p>
<p>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>The future implications of continuing constraints are discussed, notably in terms of the programme's ability to further expand accessibility, gender equality, and equity (p. 32). The conclusions provide a balanced view of the programme's strengths and weaknesses (pp. 33-37).</p>
<p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Yes	<p>The conclusions shed further light on the findings and thus provide added value. They are relevant to the various levels of programme stakeholders, although it is not clear how reflective they are of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.</p>
<p>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes	
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Yes	
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The findings and conclusions provide an in-depth assessment of the ECD programme and a balanced view of its strengths and weaknesses. While evidence derived from secondary sources is attributed to various documents consulted, the primary sources of data from which some findings are derived/triangulated are not made explicit.</p>	

Highly satisfactory

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are firmly grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported. They are clearly stated and relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation. They are not prioritized (pp. 38-41).	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes		
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Mostly		
Usefulness of recommendations			
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Yes	Each recommendation clearly identifies UNICEF as the target group for action (pp. 38-41). All recommendations are realistic in the context of the evaluation. It is not clear from the report what process was followed in developing the recommendations.	Highly satisfactory
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Yes		
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	Mostly		
Appropriate lessons learned			
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Yes	The lessons learned are incorporated with the conclusions (Ch. 5) and are correctly identified; they indicate broader relevance but an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object is not specifically provided.	While the recommendations are clearly supported by the findings and conclusions, it is useful to prioritize them (e.g., short, medium, long term) when there are several of them. Future reports should also separate lessons learned from conclusions and illustrate how lessons can be applied to broader contexts outside of the evaluated object.
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	Mostly		
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	All recommendations targeted to UNICEF are grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported. They are clearly stated, realistic, and relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation. The lessons learned are integrated with the conclusions and have relevance beyond the particular context of the programme under review, although there is no specific analysis of how they could be applied to other contexts.		

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
Style and presentation				
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	The opening pages contain all the basic elements except a list of tables and figures is missing. The report is logically structured. The annexes contain appropriate elements and increase the usefulness of the report somewhat but providing additional elements in annex would have buttressed the report further.	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.
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes			
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Mostly			
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	No			
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	No			
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	No			
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	No			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The report is well structured, logical, and clear. It remains focused throughout, providing an in-depth assessment of the ECDP in conformity with the evaluation TOR. Some additional elements in annex would have strengthened the report further. An executive summary is not available for review.			
Additional Information				
Question	Remarks			
i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	The evaluation successfully addresses the TOR.			
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The graphic and narrative description of the theory of change underpinning the programme demonstrates good practice in evaluation.			
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Several programmatic and sector-specific good practices are identified: ELDS, HRBA/equity approach in ECD programming, steady dialogue with ministerial representatives on sectoral issues, etc.			

OVERALL RATING				
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.	
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Yes	Each of the six sections of the evaluation report provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act.	Highly satisfactory	This is a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	The six sections of the report hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads and remains focused throughout.		
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	ToRs			
	Other			
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	All in all, this is a good evaluation report that provides valuable insights into the multiplicity of factors triggered by UNICEF's ELD programme that have contributed to system changes in ELSR policy making and programming in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.			