

EVALUATION ID	2850-2013/016
---------------	---------------

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

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

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

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

UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System	UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System	UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards
--	--	---

	Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Impact evaluation of Construye T (UN Joint Programme)				
Report sequence number	2013/016	Date of Review	23/04/2014	Year of the Evaluation Report	2013
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office		Country	Mexico	
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>)	2.7 Not clear from Report				La participación de UNICEF en el programa así como en la evaluación no es clara.
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.				Es un análisis del impacto del programa en los indicadores nacionales.
MTSP Correspondence (<i>Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights</i>)	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (2. Basic education & gender equality)				
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.				Se entiende de manera implícita en el reporte.
Approach	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme				El informe es principalmente de carácter sumativo dado el énfasis en el impacto del programa en los indicadores nacionales. Sin embargo, si incluye sugerencias a considerar en el futuro.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION					
Question	cc	Remarks			
Object and context					
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	El programa Construye T que es el objeto de la evaluación se encuentra bien descrito. Los elementos que lo componen son mencionados en la sección "Introducción y Antecedentes de Construye T". Una breve descripción del contexto en el que se desarrolla el programa también es incluida en esta misma sección. Los factores tanto externos como individuales que tienen ingerencia en el problema de la permanencia de los estudiantes en la Educación Media Superior (EMS) son abordados y pueden servir para iluminar los hallazgos.	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.	No	En el reporte no se incluye ni se hace ningun intento por reconstruir el marco lógico del programa o la cadena de resultados de Construye T.	Mostly Satisfactory El reporte contiene una breve pero clara descripción del programa a evaluar. El contexto y los principales factores que intervienen en la deserción escolar son mencionados (el revisor no tuvo acceso a las notas al pie, donde propablemente se incluyan las referencias de la literatura sobre los factores que afectan este fenómeno). La debilidad de esta sección se encuentra en la falta de los siguientes elementos: la inclusión de la cadena de resultados, una clara descripción de las partes interesadas y su involucramiento en el programa y por último el estatus de la implantación del programa.		
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	Mostly			Las partes interesadas son suscitamente mencionadas en la segunda seccion "Introducción y Antecedentes de Construye T".	
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	No	En esta misma sección el lector toma conocimiento de la composición del "Comité Construye T" sin que por ello quede claro los roles y responsabilidades de cada miembro.	El reporte contiene una breve pero concisa revisión de los factores que intervienen en la deserción escolar. La inclusión de la cadena de resultados que corresponde al programa es necesaria. En caso de que la documentación del programa no la contenga; es considerado una buena practica que el evaluador trate de recrearla. Otra de las partes medulares que debe contener una evaluación es la atribución de responsabilidades de las diferentes partes interesadas. Su inclusión es altamente recomendada.		
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Mostly	La participación de UNICEF en esta evaluación no es clara. Una sola referencia asevera que UNICEF se ha encargado de impulsar el desarrollo del programa se encuentra en la página 5.			
Implementation Status					
8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Mostly	La implementación del program no es claramente descrita. Sabemos que el programa fue diseñado en 2007 que su implementación comenzó en 2008 y que la información que las fuentes secundarias que fueron utilizadas para la evaluación de impacto van hasta 2010. A pesar de poseer esta información no es claro para el lector si el programa continua en funcionamiento y no hay ninguna mención sobre algún cambio significativo en su implementación.			

Executive Feedback on Section A

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

Up to two sentences

La buena descripción del programa se encuentra acompañada de una breve pero concisa descripción de su contexto. Varios elementos importantes no son incluidos en el reporte como la cadena de resultados, la participación de las partes interesadas y el estatus de la implementación no se describe claramente.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
<p>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.</p>	Mostly	<p>La tercera sección del reporte "Descripción de la Evaluación de Impacto" menciona superficialmente el propósito de la evaluación. Se asevera que a unos años del funcionamiento resulta fundamental evaluar su impacto con respecto a sus metas y objetivos. La identificación de logros y espacios a mejorar es mencionada con el fin de incrementar el desempeño del programa sin embargo, cierta información primordial como exactamente cuantos años después de su implantación han pasado, quién necesita esta información y quién estará a cargo de recibir e implementar ésta retroalimentación no son incluidos. Los objetivos de la evaluación son enlistados. El alcance de la evaluación es mencionado muy tarde dentro del reporte. En la sección III.3 se nos notifica que el alcance fue determinado por "temporalidad de las encuestas" que sirvieron como base para la evaluación. Los objetivos y el alcance están en concordancia con el propósito de la evaluación.</p>	
<p>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</p>	Yes		
<p>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)</p>	Mostly		
Evaluation framework			
<p>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></p>	Yes	<p>Highly satisfactory</p>	
<p>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.</p>	N/A		
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
		<p>El propósito de la evaluación es descrito de manera sucinta. El lector aprende que el alcance de la misma es determinado por la disponibilidad de los datos de las encuestas que fueron utilizadas. Los objetivos son claramente estipulados. De los criterios OCDE-DAC la evaluación sólo hace referencia al impacto.</p>	<p>Los propósitos, objetivos y el alcance de la evaluación deben de ser claramente establecidos desde el principio del reporte de evaluación.</p>

Executive Feedback on Section B

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

Up to two sentences

Fuera de los objetivos que son claramente definidos, el alcance y el propósito de la evaluación podría haber sido incluidos de una manera más precisa al principio de la sección e inclusive del reporte.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Data collection			
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	La recopilación de datos y los métodos para su análisis son ampliamente discutidos. La tercer sección "Descripción de la Evaluación de Impacto" expone las encuestas a partir de las cuales se hizo la evaluación. La disponibilidad de los datos así como sus limitantes son expuestos.	<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>	Outstanding		
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>	Mostly	La participación de los alumnos en las encuestas nacionales se menciona como voluntaria. Este es el único aspecto que hace referencia a algún tipo de salvaguarda ética. Dado el uso de fuentes secundarias, esta evaluación tuvo menos cuestiones de ética a considerar de forma directa aunque pudo haber comentado más sobre los procedimientos con relación a la ética en las encuestas nacionales. Cuestiones éticas sobre el diseño del programa, sobre la participación de determinados grupos (escuelas federales o estatales) no es tratado.	
<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>	Mostly		
Results Based Management			
<p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	No	Los evaluadores no hacen comentario alguno sobre el sistema de seguimiento del programa. En el resumen ejecutivo se establece que "la implementación del programa, no incluyó un diseño de evaluación" y que la evaluación de impacto se hará a partir de datos secundarios.	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>La metodología de evaluación es clara en su descripción y se muestra adecuada para abordar los objetivos del programa Construye T, sin embargo, importantes elementos no fueron incluidos en la misma. Uno de ellos es la omisión sobre el estado del sistema de seguimiento y evaluación del programa. El planteamiento de metodología no contiene elementos éticos, de género, equidad o con perspectiva de derechos humanos, que son consideraciones importantes para UNICEF.</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>	N/A		
			<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p> <p>El uso de encuestas a nivel nacional es una buena practica que inclusive intenta ser fomentada. Este reporte hace buen uso de la información a nivel país. Por otro lado las referencias sobre el sistema de seguimiento y monitoreo del propio programa deben ser mencionadas por los evaluadores. Sea cual sea el estado de este sistema, inclusive su inexistencia. La inclusión de elementos éticos, de género, equidad y desde una perspectiva de derechos humanos es importante, sobre todo tomando en consideración el objetivo del programa evaluado.</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

No

La evaluación no incluye ningún tipo de análisis con una perspectiva de derechos humanos, igualdad de género y/o equidad. Si bien algunas de las variables hacen referencia a este tipo de temática e.g. proporción de hombres, proporción de los estudiantes que hablan una lengua indígena y puntaje de la escala de depresión y puntaje de violencia familiar, estas variables son consideradas como control y la información no es desagregada por sexo. Dado que el programa Construye T es un programa que trata con niños y adolescentes deberíamos esperar alguna referencia sobre los derechos de los niños y adolescentes.

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

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.

No

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.

No

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.

No

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>	N/A	<p>La evaluación se llevó a cabo por medio de la recolección de datos secundarios. Por ende, no se contemplaba mayor participación de los actores clave. Los evaluadores especifican que la participación de los niños y adolescentes en las encuestas nacionales se hizo de manera voluntaria en base a una selección aleatoria del grado dentro del plantel de Educación Media Superior que fue seleccionado a partir del muestreo.</p>
<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>	N/A	
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>	Yes	<p>La evaluación justifica la imposibilidad de incluir un grupo control que los estándares de la metodología de "treat in the treated" exige. La razón es el pequeño tamaño de la muestra. A pesar de esto los evaluadores abordan un enfoque complementario para tener un grupo de control. La metodología es capaz de responder a los 4 principales objetivos que se plantearon los evaluadores así como a las preguntas sobre las tasas de deserción y reprobación. Las limitaciones metodológicas son abordadas de manera clara en el reporte. Los evaluadores realizan la evaluación a partir de información secundaria proveniente de encuestas a nivel país, (práctica que busca ser fomentada) ya que el programa no contiene un sistema de seguimiento y evaluación formalmente definido.</p>
<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>La metodología utilizada es claramente descrita, incluyendo las limitaciones que esta podría encontrar. En contraste, adolece de una perspectiva de derechos humanos, género, equidad y de la inclusión de referencias sobre las salvaguardas éticas relevantes a las fuentes secundarias.</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.	Yes	Los hallazgos se basan en la evidencia provista de la recolección de datos hecha a partir del formulario 911 y de las Encuesta de Exclusión Intolerancia y Violencia en Escuelas de Educación Media Superior. Sin embargo, la presentación de los mismos hace difícil su identificación. El criterio que los evaluadores utilizaron es el de impacto, no obstante, el revisor no tuvo acceso a los Términos de Referencia para determinar si es el único criterio OCDE/DAC requerido. Lagunas y limitaciones son discutidos a lo largo del reporte por ejemplo en la sección III.2 "Objetivos de la Evaluación" el programa evaluado establecía 6 objetivos; los evaluadores decidieron abordar sólo 4 de esos 6 objetivos argumentando que "Participación juvenil" y "Proyecto de vida" no podían ser evaluados por la necesidad de una recolección de datos cualitativos. Los hallazgos inesperados son mencionados en las seccion de "Resultados". Un análisis en lugar de su simple mención hubiera contribuido significativamente a la evaluación.	Mostly Satisfactory	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			
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.	Mostly			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	No			
			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
			Una presentación clara y distintiva de los hallazgos puede mejorar la comprensión del texto y su legibilidad. La inclusión de información referente a costos, contribución de partes interesadas y de conclusiones contribuiría a la credibilidad y robustez del reporte.	

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Mostly	La evaluación hace un esfuerzo razonable para estimar los efectos del Programa, considerando los datos que se están utilizando que provienen de las encuestas nacionales. La metodología ofrece una forma de estimar los efectos sobre los indicadores, pero no permite aislar completamente el efecto del Programa Construye-T. Por ejemplo, lo que no está claro es si hubo también otros programas en las escuelas (estatales, federales, de OSC) que incidieron en los cambios en los indicadores. La metodología planteada tampoco permite establecer razones causales para los éxitos y las debilidades.
<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>	No	
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>	No	Ninguna restricción que pudiera afectar el programa fue abordada. El reporte no contiene una sección de conclusiones.
<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>	No	
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>	N/A	
<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>	N/A	
<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>	N/A	
<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>Los hallazgos del reporte se sustentan en la evidencia recolectada y el criterio de impacto es abordado de una forma razonable usando datos secundarios de encuestas nacionales. No obstante, el informe se podría fortalecer con información relevante sobre costos y especialmente con la integración de conclusiones.</p>	

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	No	Las recomendaciones que se presentan se asemejan a conclusiones ya que se derivan de la evidencia. Las recomendaciones, en lo general, son enunciaciones más operacionales, claras, factibles y dirigidas hacia alguna parte interesada. Otro aspecto a mencionar es que las recomendaciones enunciadas abordan el objetivo "Proyecto de Vida" del programa Contruye T que los evaluadores advirtieron no tratarían por la necesidad de recolectar información cualitativa (pg. 9). Las recomendaciones deben de estar sustentadas a partir del análisis de los hallazgos, por ende, es preferible abstenerse de hacer recomendaciones sobre aspectos que no han sido incluidos en la evaluación.	<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	No		
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	No		
Usefulness of recommendations			
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	No	Las recomendaciones no fueron dirigidas a ninguna parte interesada en específico.	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Las recomendaciones abordan elementos importantes para el objeto y el propósito del programa sin embargo, su contenido no es accionable ni está dirigido hacia ninguna parte interesada. Su estructuración asemeja más a las conclusiones de un reporte. Las lecciones aprendidas no fueron incluidas.</p>
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	N/A		
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.	N/A		
Appropriate lessons learned			
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	No	Lecciones aprendidas no fueron incluidas en el reporte.	<p>La clara distinción entre conclusiones, recomendaciones y lecciones aprendidas es de primordial importancia para la correcta divulgación de la información proveniente de una evaluación. Las conclusiones deben reflejar los hallazgos que provienen del análisis de los datos. Las recomendaciones por su parte deben ser claras, viables y razonables, buscando en todo momento ser accionables. Es imperativo que sean dirigidas a alguna parte interesada en específico. Las lecciones aprendidas por su parte son observaciones basadas en el análisis de hallazgos recurrentes. Deben de proporcionar luz para otros proyectos similares.</p>
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	No		

Executive Feedback on Section E

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

Up to two sentences

Las recomendaciones presentadas no se muestran suficientemente accionables y dirigidas hacia alguna parte interesada. De hecho su formulación asemeja más a las conclusiones de un reporte. Las lecciones aprendidas no fueron incluidas en el reporte.

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	Mostly	El inicio del reporte presenta bien el objeto evaluado, sin embargo, el periodo que comprende la evaluación, el año de la evaluación, nombre de las organizaciones que comisionaron el reporte y el nombre de la compañía encargada de la evaluación no son incluidos. Las primeras secciones del reporte siguen una estructura lógica, sin embargo, las últimas secciones no se encuentran bien delimitadas o fueron omitidas como una sección clara con las conclusiones y con las lecciones aprendidas. Los anexos aunque contienen información sobre la metodología aun adolecen de elementos importantes como los TDR.	Mostly Satisfactory	
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Mostly			
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	Mostly			
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	Yes	Un resumen ejecutivo es presentado y contiene una visión de conjunto del objeto evaluado, los objetivos y la metodología utilizada. No obstante, el resumen ejecutivo no contiene ninguna de las recomendaciones establecidas en el reporte.	Mostly Satisfactory	
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	Mostly			
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	Mostly			
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>	Las primeras secciones del reporte se encuentran bien estructuradas. No obstante, a partir de los resultados (III.7) las secciones muestran debilidades importantes (recomendaciones) o fueron omitidas (conclusiones y lecciones aprendidas). En consecuencia el resumen ejecutivo refleja esas debilidades.			
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	Los Terminos de referencia no estuvieron al alcance del revisor.			
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	El uso de sistemas de datos del país como las encuesta de Exclusión, Intolerancia y Violencia en Escuelas de Educación Media Superior es una buena práctica que inclusive se trata de impulsar.			
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Sin comentarios.			

OVERALL RATING				
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.	
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Mostly	La exposición del objeto a evaluar, la recolección de los datos, el tratamiento de los mismos y la presentación de los resultados se muestran de manera clara y bien estructurada, sin embargo, el análisis de esos resultados se muestra incompleto. Algunas de las subsecuentes secciones derivadas de los resultados como conclusiones y lecciones aprendidas no son incluidas (ambas secciones sumamente importantes para una evaluación de impacto). Por añadidura, la sección de "recomendaciones" no contiene la operatividad requerida para impulsar la acción.	Mostly Satisfactory	El reporte inicia con una buena descripción del objeto a evaluar. La metodología es bien justificada, aborda los objetivos y sirve al propósito de la evaluación. Dentro de las debilidades de esta metodología encontramos que adolece de una perspectiva de derechos humanos, género, equidad y de la inclusión de salvaguardas éticas propiamente establecidas. A pesar de los buenos puntos antes mencionados sobre la metodología lo que debilita la evaluación es el subsecuente análisis de la información recolectada. La falta de conclusiones, la inadecuada estructuración de las recomendaciones y la no inclusión de lecciones aprendidas lo que limita la utilidad del reporte.
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'.	No	Como se menciona anteriormente las 6 secciones no son todas suficientemente robustas para que el reporte sea consistente y lógico.		
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	No fueron accesibles al revisor.		
	Other	Sin comentario		
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	El objeto y el contexto de la evaluación se describen claramente. La metodología se muestra adecuada salvo por la falta de inclusión de elementos sobre género, equidad y una perspectiva de derechos humanos. La debilidad de esta evaluación radica en como presenta el análisis de los datos recolectados, pues el reporte no incluye una sección que presente las conclusiones del estudio, las recomendaciones no son accionables y no se encuentran dirigidas a una parte interesada en específico y las lecciones aprendidas no fueron incluidas. Los tres elementos faltantes son primordiales para contribuir a la utilidad de la evaluación.			