**UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Coding</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Dark green</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section &amp; Overall Rating</td>
<td>Outstanding, best practice</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

---

### UNICEF Standards for Evaluation in the UN System

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

---

### Classification of Evaluation Report

- **Geographical**: Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings
- **Management of Evaluation**: Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions
- **Purpose**: Spreads to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d’être
- **Result**: Level of change sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached
- **MTSP Correspondence**: 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
- **Level of Independence**: Implementation and control of the evaluation activities
- **Stage**: The evaluation is implemented by consultants but managed in-house by UNICEF professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies within the division whose work is being evaluated.

---

### Report sequence number

- **2012/010**

### Date of Review

- **29/04/2013**

### Year of the Evaluation Report

- **2012**

### Region

- **Country**: USA
- **Name of reviewer**: Violence Against Children

### Title of the Evaluation Report

- **Protecting Children from Violence - Synthesis of Evaluation Findings**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Evaluation Report</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical (Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</td>
<td>1.5 Multi-region/Global: The programme is implemented in two or more regions, or deliberately targets all regions. The evaluation would typically sample several countries across multiple regions, with the results intended to be generalizable in two or more regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>3.9 Regional/ Multi-country programme evaluation: An evaluation that assesses several programmes from a regional or multi-country perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result (Level of change sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</td>
<td>Synthesis of evaluation findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (4. Child Protection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence (Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</td>
<td>Violence Against Children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Name of reviewer

- **FORs Present**: Yes
## SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Object and context</th>
<th>Theory of Change</th>
<th>Stakeholders and their contributions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Executive Feedback on Section A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td>The object of this meta-synthesis are the 52 evaluations analysed. Therefore Q1 is not relevant in this exercise.</td>
<td>There is no results chain in a meta-synthesis.</td>
<td>There are many stakeholder contributions throughout the programmes considered in the 52 evaluations. Therefore, this section is not applicable.</td>
<td>This question is not relevant to the meta-synthesis, given that it covers a large number of programmes.</td>
<td>The report introduces a brief overview of the strategies and frameworks behind UNICEF's work on violence against children. However, the wider context of this theme as well as its importance to UNICEF should be highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td>Section 1.1.2 provides a description of the strategies and frameworks that are the basis for the meta-analysis and of the evaluations analysed. However, it would have been helpful to include a brief overview of violence against children and child protection, and explain the importance of these themes to UNICEF. This would have added some value to the findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Does this illuminate findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</td>
<td>There are many stakeholder contributions throughout the programmes considered in the 52 evaluations. Therefore, this section is not applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Are key stakeholders’ contributions described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Is the implementation status described?</td>
<td>This question is not relevant to the meta-synthesis, given that it covers a large number of programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Executive Feedback on Section A</td>
<td>The wider context of the 'violence against children,' theme as well as its importance to UNICEF should have been highlighted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*

*Including key stakeholders in the evaluation process to ensure comprehensive coverage.*

*Enhance the context section with more detailed information on the background and significance of the evaluated theme.*

*Ensure the results chain is clearly articulated for a better understanding of the outcomes.*

*Identify key stakeholders and their contributions to provide a holistic view of the evaluation.*

*Clarify the implementation status to assess the effectiveness of the evaluated strategies.*

*Provide comprehensive feedback on the evaluation process for future improvement.*
### Purpose, objectives and scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</td>
<td>The objectives and scope of the evaluation clearly explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve, and the areas that will be covered (p.1). More details on the scope of the meta-synthesis can be found in section 2.1. Section 11.2 informs on the rationale for conducting this assessment, clarifying why the information is needed and how it is expected to be used by stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>The evaluation framework could have been improved by adding the evaluation questions intended to be addressed and the evaluation criteria that will not only guide, but also structure the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</td>
<td>Although the purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation are stated clearly, the evaluators are not clear in describing the evaluation framework and criteria used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</td>
<td>The Synthesis Evaluation does not list the evaluation criteria explicitly, but it lists the areas covered in the synthesis report (Box 1). However, the report is not structured around these areas, and it is unclear what criteria was actually used (if any). The report mentions that there was an analytical framework, but the framework is not included nor described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</td>
<td>The evaluation framework outlining the criteria and questions that guide and structure the report is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampling methods and benchmarks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection, and their limitations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues described?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object’s</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring system adequately assessed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the evaluated object?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?**

The report should provide a clear explanation of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes. The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.
### Human Rights, Gender and Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Most Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity &amp; child rights) frameworks?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 immediate underlying &amp; structural causes of the non realisation of rights; capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &amp; structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &amp; aspects of equity.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this report synthesises the findings across a variety of evaluations, it does a good job in summarising the overall quality of the RBM and M&E systems as well as synthesising information on HRBA, gender and equity across the programmes being evaluated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>An analytical framework was developed in consultation with stakeholders, and all deliverables were reviewed by the Reference group (UNICEF HQ staff), which constitutes exemplary participation of stakeholders for the task at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The breadth &amp; degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible &amp; preferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</td>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, 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 method of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section C**

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

Up to two sentences

The report provides a clear explanation of the methodology used to collect, sample and analyse data. Stakeholder participation and feedback in the development of the analytical framework gives confidence that the methodology is appropriate to address UNICEF’s needs. Throughout the report, a great synthesis of the quality of M&E systems and incorporation of HRBA, gender and equity in the programmes is provided.
## SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The findings compile the evidence from 52 evaluation reports according to a list of focus areas. The raw evidence is shown in tables throughout the report and findings and conclusion are drawn from these. Through not based on a logical chain, the meta-synthesis analyses the results according to the strategies/type of interventions used, as stated in the evaluation reports (e.g. advocacy, technical assistance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation’s stated criteria and questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations and gaps are discussed in the methodology section. It is not possible to know whether the evaluation questions and criteria are exhaustively addressed, because these are not provided by the evaluators. However, all of the areas that were supposed to be covered are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>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. Gaps 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since this is a meta-synthesis, it is not relevant to include a cost analysis, though the author does make reference to overall costs and examples of costs in programmes, based on the evaluations reviewed (4.7.3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constructive feedback for future reports

- **Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice**
  - Although the findings chapters are lengthy, the evaluators do an excellent job in compiling all the evidence from 52 evaluation reports and provide insights and conclusions on the effectiveness of child protection strategies in relation to the results. There are no clear criteria in the meta-synthesis and the questions are not included. Therefore, it is impossible to affirm that the findings address all of the evaluation criteria and questions.  
  - Chapters 2-4 (findings) are lengthy, partly because of the tables included (where the relevant raw data from evaluation reports is gathered). While this data is interesting, the tables could have been provided in the annexes instead to facilitate reading and understanding the main findings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign</td>
<td>As this is a meta-synthesis, it is not possible to contribute results to specific stakeholders. On the other hand, the report does reflect an effort to synthesise and generalise the types of interventions that are the most and least effective, thus identifying causal reasons for accomplishments and failures (i.e. p.45).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. (This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much as possible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</td>
<td>Section 4.8 touches upon some possible continuing constraints. The conclusions present a great synthesis of the strengths and weaknesses of the programmes reviewed, though a greater focus is given to weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluated object?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues</td>
<td>The conclusion presents an excellent synthesis of the findings, providing clear insights and a summarised analysis of the effectiveness of child protection strategies in relation to the results achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that add value to the findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section of stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 sensibly, adding value and understanding to the report (for example, 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>users of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section D**

Although quite lengthy, the findings use the 52 evaluations to produce a great synthesis of the overall effectiveness of child protection strategies in relation to the results achieved. The conclusions simplify the findings and provide an overall outlook of child protection strategies, their strengths and weaknesses.
### SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations are based on the evidence in the findings and conclusion, and they are relevant to the purpose of the assignment, as they distil the findings, lessons and recommendations across child protection-related evaluations. Although the recommendations are clearly stated, they are not prioritised and are very lengthy, being somewhat scattered throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>The recommendations are relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation. However, they do not take into account the potential complexities of their implementation and are not prioritised. The lessons learned are too numerous, but they are relevant to the purpose of the assignment as per the TORs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations are clearly stated, they are not prioritised and are very lengthy, being somewhat scattered throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Only some recommendations identify the target group for action. Although it is known that the Evaluation Reference Group reviewed all the deliverables, their involvement in developing the recommendations is not as clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions of the report?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations are based on the evidence in the findings and conclusion, and they are relevant to the purpose of the assignment, as they distil the findings, lessons and recommendations across child protection-related evaluations. Although the recommendations are clearly stated, they are not prioritised and are very lengthy, being somewhat scattered throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Although quite lengthy, lessons learned contribute to general knowledge and can be applied in other contexts. These are spread throughout the report (pp.68, 82, 127, 166, 226, 240, 244) and later summarised in Appendix 4. The lessons learned should have had a dedicated section in the report, coming after the recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied in contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object. The lessons learned are too numerous, but these contribute to general knowledge and reasonably inform programming in different contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usefulness of recommendations
- Only some recommendations identify the target group for action. Although it is known that the Evaluation Reference Group reviewed all the deliverables, their involvement in developing the recommendations is not as clear.

#### Appropriateness of recommendations
- The recommendations are lengthy and simplistic at times. The evaluators do not explicitly recognise the possible constraints for implementing these recommendations.

**Executive Feedback on Section E:**

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

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 in contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object. The recommendations should all be reiterated in the last "recommendations" section.

The recommendations should have been prioritised and systematically targeted. Lessons learned could have been shortened and placed directly after the recommendations section.

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

- Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.
### SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All of the relevant elements are included in the opening pages, as are almost all of the relevant annexes that add value to the findings. The evaluators should have included the analytical framework used in this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Executive Summary

- **Overall**, the report is logically structured, but some measures could have been taken to shorten it, without sacrificing the richness of its content.
- The evaluation successfully addresses the TORs.
- The report contains all of the information required and stands alone, as it underlined the main findings. However, its lengthiness (15 pages) limits its utility for decision-makers.

- **The executive summary**: should provide a quick overview of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- The executive summary could have better synthesised these sections.
- The report is quite lengthy. In order to shorten it, the evaluators could have placed the recommendations and lessons learned in the last sections. Additionally, the tables showing the evidence or analysed evidence in the evaluation reports could have been placed in the annex section.

- **The report is logically structured overall, but the main body is lengthy and measures could have been taken to shorten it, without sacrificing the richness of its content.**
- **The executive summary provides all of the relevant information, but it is too lengthy to be truly useful to decision-makers.**
- The report is logically structured, overall. However, recommendations and lessons learned are spread throughout the report. The report is also quite lengthy; the constructive feedback provides suggestions on how to make it shorter and facilitate reading.

- **The report is logically structured, but some measures could have been taken to shorten it, without sacrificing the quality of its content.**
- The summary could have better synthesised these sections.
- The executive summary is also very lengthy, although it does provide a good overview of the evaluation's findings, conclusions and recommendations.

#### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</td>
<td>The evaluation successfully addresses the TORs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation in terms of evaluation</td>
<td>Stakeholders provided feedback on all the deliverables. This constitutes best practice, because it ensures ownership and participation of stakeholders, as well as accuracy of the information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation in terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section F**: Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

- **Highly satisfactory**
- **Outstanding**
- **Satisfactory**
- **Moderate**
- **Low**
- **Very Low**
- **Insufficient**
- **Very Insufficient**

**Up to two sentences**

- Stakeholders provided feedback on all the deliverables. This constitutes best practice, because it ensures ownership and participation of stakeholders, as well as accuracy of the information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</td>
<td>Overall, the methodology, evidence, findings and conclusions are credible. However, the recommendations need some improvement.</td>
<td>Although there is no clear evaluation framework, the meta-synthesis does a great job at addressing the purpose of the assignment as per the TORs. The report offers a strong methodology, evidence-based findings and valuable conclusions. However, the recommendations could have been prioritised, and they should have taken into consideration the potential complexities of their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</td>
<td>The six sections hold together and are consistent throughout.</td>
<td>The six sections hold together and are consistent throughout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</td>
<td>The TORs do not indicate an evaluation framework nor questions.</td>
<td>The TORs do not indicate an evaluation framework nor questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Feedback on Overall Rating

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

The meta-synthesis does an excellent job at addressing the purpose of the assignment as per the TORs. The report offers a strong methodology, evidence-based findings and valuable conclusions. However, the recommendations could have been prioritised, and they should have taken into consideration the potential complexities of their implementation.