



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

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Very Confident to Act	Confident to Act	Almost Confident to Act	Not Confident to Act	

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	
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>An Evaluation on the Creating Safe Places for Learning in Schools Project: 2007 - 10</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2011/001
<b>Date of Review</b>	04/04/2012
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2011
<b>Region</b>	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Jamaica
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation
<b>TORs Present</b>	Yes
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	IOD PARC
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
<b>Geographical</b> <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation)</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.
<b>Management</b> <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.
<b>Purpose</b> <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.1 Pilot: Where a new solution, approach, or programme is being tested at a national or sub-national level, the evaluation examines the efficacy of such an intervention with the intention to determine suitability for scaling-up.
<b>Result</b> <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM; refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control
<b>MTSP Correspondence</b> <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 (4. Child Protection)
<b>Level of Independence</b> <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.2 Independent internal: 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.
<b>Timing / Stage</b>	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme
	There are elements of formative and summative.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Object and context</b>			
<b>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</b> This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Almost	The project description is brief. Context (including project need, related government programmes, and relevant legislation), overview of partners, project objectives and components, and rationale for selection of participating schools are briefly covered, but there is little or no information on choice of intervention design, how components interact, timescales, costs, governance or project management.	<p><b>A/ Does the report present a clear &amp; full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b> The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals &amp; priorities, as appropriate.</p>
<b>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</b> The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Almost		
<b>3 Does this illuminate findings?</b> The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Almost		
<b>Theory of Change</b>			
<b>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b> The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Almost	The objectives and some activities / outputs are very briefly mentioned, and 'outcomes' / 'expected results' are included in 'Findings' and an 'evaluation matrix' appendix, but the overall results chains or logic model is not coherently explained.	Almost Confident to Act
<b>Stakeholders and their contributions</b>			
<b>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</b> These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	Key stakeholders are identified, and their responsibilities mentioned, but no information is given about resource inputs.	
<b>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	No	UNICEF's contribution to one aspect of the project is stated as financial and technical but no other detail is given.	
<b>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	No		
<b>Implementation Status</b>			
<b>8 Is the implementation status described?</b> This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Yes	Various aspects of implementation, including both negative and positive changes, are mentioned in different sections of the report.	
<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The object of the evaluation is insufficiently made clear as part of the introduction with in particular insufficient attention to the project results framework. This limits the accessibility of the report to readers not familiar with the project.</b>		

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

The description of the object of the evaluation should include a description of the theory of change so that it is clear to the reader how project activities were meant to result in outcomes that are expected to contribute to realization of program goals.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Purpose, objectives and scope</b>					
<b>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</b> This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	No	The purpose of the evaluation is not made clear, nor are details on expected use of evaluation results provided. Evaluation objectives are included and appear to refer to the aspects included in the baseline study. Objectives focus on issues of effectiveness and impact with in particular on impact no further evaluation questions specified.	<b>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>  The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
<b>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b> This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Almost				
<b>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</b> The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Almost				
<b>Evaluation framework</b>					
<b>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</b> It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include: Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	No	The report makes mention of aspects of effectiveness and includes the evaluation criterion of impact. There is no reference made to the DAC Evaluation criteria and use of the two criteria is not justified and the issue of impact is not sufficiently specified. Moreover, there is no justification for the omission of relevance, efficiency and sustainability from the evaluation objectives.	<b>Not Confident to Act</b>	The purpose is not made clear while evaluating objectives and scope are insufficiently worked out. This means that purpose and objectives are not sufficiently clear to provide guidance to the evaluation process. There is no justification of the use of effectiveness and impact, nor of the omission of using relevance, efficiency and sustainability.	Purpose and objectives / scope of any evaluation are best made explicit and detailed under separate headings in the report so that the reader is well informed about why the evaluation is conducted, what the expected use is of the evaluation results, what the focus of the evaluation is and what it is meant to cover.
<b>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</b> The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	No				
<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The purpose is not made clear while evaluating objectives and scope are insufficiently worked out. This means that purpose and objectives are not clear enough to provide sufficient guidance to the evaluation process.</b>				

**SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY**

Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Data collection</b>			<p><b>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</b></p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b>  <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</b>                      This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	<p>Details on data collection methods are clearly provided and relatively robust. The approach includes quantitative and qualitative methodologies and appears appropriate for the task at hand, though the rationale underlying the approach is not made explicit. Sampling of schools is included and well justified. Based on information in the annex, it appears that selection of school based professionals, parents and students is made by the school, based on the generic issue of exposure to the project'. This is not further detailed or justified as part of the methodology. Details on data sources are provided (including weaknesses in baseline and monitoring data) though no assessment is made of the quality of the baseline data that will be used in terms of comparison in the evaluation.</p>		
<p><b>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</b>                      This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits</p>	Almost	<p>Details on data collection methods are clearly provided and relatively robust. The approach includes quantitative and qualitative methodologies and appears appropriate for the task at hand, though the rationale underlying the approach is not made explicit. Sampling of schools is included and well justified. Based on information in the annex, it appears that selection of school based professionals, parents and students is made by the school, based on the generic issue of exposure to the project'. This is not further detailed or justified as part of the methodology. Details on data sources are provided (including weaknesses in baseline and monitoring data) though no assessment is made of the quality of the baseline data that will be used in terms of comparison in the evaluation.</p>		
<b>Ethics</b>				
<p><b>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b>                      The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	Almost	<p>Ethical issues are referred to in the report with mention made of seeking of parental consent and guaranteeing the confidentiality of participants' input through anonymising data. However, as information from children was obtained through focus group discussions (and only 2 teachers and 2 parents from each school were interviewed) appropriate safeguards should have been explicitly put into place.</p>		
<p><b>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</b>                      When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	No	<p>Ethical issues are referred to in the report with mention made of seeking of parental consent and guaranteeing the confidentiality of participants' input through anonymising data. However, as information from children was obtained through focus group discussions (and only 2 teachers and 2 parents from each school were interviewed) appropriate safeguards should have been explicitly put into place.</p>		
<b>Results Based Management</b>			<p><b>Almost Confident to Act</b></p> <p>A transparent description of the methodology is provided that makes a strong effort to address the evaluation questions (as stated). Indeed, although the purpose, scope and questions were never adequately articulated, and there are major weaknesses in the baseline and monitoring data, the choice of methodology appears reasonably sound. There is little discussion about alternative approaches, except the difficulty of opting for random sampling. However, the evaluator's list of limitations (page10) highlights major question marks over their ability to deliver a robust methodology. Overall numbers of participants contributing their views to the evaluation are relatively small compared to</p>	<p>Assessment of the monitoring system and related capacities is important as part of an evaluation with Results Based Management as an important principle and monitoring data and information as important means to inform program decision-making. Inclusion of ethical issues and safeguards put in place is necessary in particular when interviews with children are included in the evaluation set-up.</p>
<p><b>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</b>                      The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&amp;E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	Almost	<p>Aspects of the project's M&amp;E system appear to be used though they are not being assessed as such. The overall logic model isn't detailed anywhere in the initial project description, which is an important omission in the report. No budgeting or financial data are mentioned.</p>		
<p><b>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</b>                      In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	Almost			

Human Rights, Gender and Equity		
<p><b>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?</b> 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</p>	Yes	<p>An element of the project was building understanding of child-rights among children, school-based professionals and parents, and efforts were made to use human-rights, gender- and child-sensitive language. However, the project monitoring framework did not utilise a human rights or gender monitoring approach. Although the evaluation data collection did not explicitly seek gender-equal participation, the data collected was disaggregated and analysed by gender and (to an extent) age bracket. As a main project component offering rights sensitising for children was cancelled (though it was offered for school-based professionals), only limited information on children's rights is provided in the Findings section of this evaluation.</p>
<p><b>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?</b> 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.</p>	No	
<p><b>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)?</b> 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 &amp; structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.</p>	Almost	
<p><b>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</b> 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.</p>	Almost	
<p><b>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</b> 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.</p>	No	
Stakeholder participation		

the number of participants in the overall project scope. Ethics and gender-disaggregation issues are reasonably covered but there isn't a strong application of human rights or participatory frameworks.

<p><b>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</b> This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	No	Stakeholder participation appears to have been limited to the provision of information and, in the case of the project partners, hand-picking children, school-based professionals and parents to be involved in the evaluation.			
<p><b>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</b> The breadth &amp; degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible &amp; preferable.</p>	Almost				
<b>Methodological robustness</b>					
<p><b>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual?</b> The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	No	There was no attempt to construct a counterfactual though this would have clearly been possible with part of the schools not having initiated any activities yet. Overall, the evaluation methodology provides a reasonably robust approach with a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods which can be expected to be able to answers the objectives of the evaluation. Avoidance of bias was addressed through standardised interviews / surveys, and gathering of data from child, parent, professionals' views, allowing for triangulation of data. Limitations appear mostly out of the control of the evaluator and can be taken into account in the evaluation process.			
<p><b>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</b> The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes				
<p><b>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</b> Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Yes				
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>Details on data sources and collection methods are provided and the approach appears relatively robust, including quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Limitations to the methodology can be taken into account in the evaluation process. The methodology as such can be expected to be able to answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation.</b></p>				

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>					
<b>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</b> Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Almost	The report focuses mostly on the presentation of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the evaluation process, and largely omits to analyse those data and to come to the formulation of findings on the level of the evaluation objectives. Only towards the end of the report, after presentation of all data, some of this happens but the linkage with the evidence is not always made explicit and clear. Gaps and limitations in the data are clearly presented and constructively discussed. Various planned and unplanned changes in project implementation are noted and taken account of.	<b>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</b> Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.		
<b>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</b> The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Almost			<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</b> There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Almost		Findings need to go beyond the mere presentation of data from the use of the various methods in the evaluation process, and need to analyse the issues presented in the objectives of the evaluation, making use of the mixture of data gathered. This allows for triangulation of data and for a clear grounding of the findings in the evidence gathered in the evaluation process. Conclusions further add to the analysis by formulation of evaluative statements on the level of the evaluation objectives. Putting all the conclusions together in one section provides an additional level of analysis.		
<b>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</b> The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes				
<b>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</b> If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	Yes				
<b>Cost Analysis</b>					

<p><b>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</b>          Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.</p>	No	<p>There is no cost or input information given, questioned, or discussed. Consideration of cost would have enabled better informed future planning and decision-making.</p>
<b>Contribution and causality</b>		
<p><b>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</b>          For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Yes	<p>The evaluation highlights that there was no clear division of labour with regards to the outcomes so it was difficult to map and attribute results. Conclusion do though appear to take account of stakeholder views.</p>
<p><b>37 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</b>          As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes	<p>As much as possible causal reasons for accomplishments and failures are given but consistent evidence was not collected by the project. It also appears to have been difficult to differentiate project results from those of the wider Safe Schools programme, but this is only brought up at the end of the findings and not further discussed and incorporated into the report.</p>
<p><b>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</b>          These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust.  <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Almost	
<b>Strengths, weaknesses and implications</b>		
<p><b>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</b>          The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>Strengths and weakness are positively addressed. Project achievements and its greater positive potential are highlighted alongside the need for project partners to refocus on developing joint visions, strategies, and better targeting and implementation plans.</p>
<p><b>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</b>          Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes	
<b>Completeness and insight of conclusions</b>		
<p><b>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</b>          Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Almost	<p>The conclusions add little to the findings and remain on the level of the results for specific stakeholders and parts of the programme as presented in the findings section. There is no attention to the extent to which these aspects have reinforced one another and under what conditions this can happen. The conclusions are not at the level of the objectives of the evaluation.</p>
<p><b>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</b>          Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Almost	
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b>          Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating.  <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The report focuses mostly on the presentation of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the evaluation process. Though there is attention to both strengths and weaknesses of the project, there is only limited attention to causal reasons of success and failure. The conclusions add little to the findings and are not at the level of the objectives of the evaluation.</b></p>	

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</b>				
<b>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</b> Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Almost	Recommendations that lead on from evidence and findings are provided, but they seem to be a step beyond, and are not succinctly presented. The accompanying Sustainability Plan is brief and could benefit from prioritisation, a timeline, and a list of action points allocated to key stakeholders. No information about 'investment' recommendations or costings is included.	<b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Almost			
<b>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</b> If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Almost			
<b>Usefulness of recommendations</b>				
<b>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</b> Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Almost	Target groups and stakeholders are mentioned but a summarised list of recommended actions is not broken down in that manner. Some recommendations appear to draw on external knowledge that has not been mentioned elsewhere in the report (e.g. Ministry of Education plans).'	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	Recommendations need to get credibility by grounding them in the findings and conclusions of the evaluation. There is more value in a limited number of recommendations, for which aspects of implementation and responsibilities concerned are worked out, than in a long list of unspecific ones. Recommendations can become more meaningful and practical when responsibilities for implementation are specified and details on the process of implementation provided.
<b>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</b> This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Almost			
<b>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</b> The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No			
<b>Appropriate lessons learned</b>				
<b>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</b> Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	No	No lessons learned have been included with this report. UNICEF/UNEG standards state that lessons learned are an essential part of any evaluation report.		
<b>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</b> Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	No			
<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>Recommendations are provided that lead on from, but are not totally based on, evidence and findings (other external insights are also brought in). A summary table of prioritised recommendations allocated to the various stakeholders could have been provided. The Sustainability Plan is succinct but not prioritised or costed. No lessons learned are provided either.</b>			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Style and presentation</b>			F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?  The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</b> Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Almost	The report is structured based on the methods applied in the evaluation and the stakeholder groups that information is gathered from. This means that information is not clearly organized by evaluation criteria or objectives and results in a lack of triangulation of data.		
<b>52 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	The report provides mainly a description of the data that were gathered rather than an analysis based on a set of evaluation criteria or objectives. This severely limits the way in which the reports comes to findings and conclusions. Opening pages miss out on essential elements including the name of the country and a specification of annexes in the table of contents. The latter moreover misses out on details on tables and figures. Annexes miss out on the TOR but otherwise do include useful additional information that enhances the credibility of the report.		
<b>53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</b> Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Almost			
<b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes			
<b>Executive Summary</b>			Almost Confident to Act	Including a copy of the full results chain could have greatly aided this evaluation report. A summary and prioritised lists of conclusions and recommendations in the Executive Summary would also help decision-makers.
<b>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</b> If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	The Executive Summary contains most of the necessary elements except the evaluation objectives and intended audience. It summarises quantitative outputs / short term outcomes but the qualitative results and conclusions are not clearly presented. Recommendations are presented in a narrative and lack sufficient clarity.		
<b>56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</b> Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Almost			
<b>57 Can the executive summary stand alone?</b> It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Almost			
<b>58 Can the executive summary inform decision making?</b> It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Almost			
<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The report is structured around the data gathered using the various methods applied rather than around the evaluation objectives. This limits the ability of the report to analyse data and come to findings and conclusions on key issues concerned. The Executive Summary omits information on the evaluation objectives and intended audience, and does not present conclusions and recommendations clear enough to inform decision-makers.</b>			
<b>Additional Information</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Remarks</b>			

<p><b>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</b> If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	<p>Problems with the TOR may be noted under Overall Rating Question 3</p>
<p><b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation</p>	
<p><b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>	

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: $\Omega$ / Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
<b>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</b> Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Almost	Most of the sections are weak or very weak.	<b>Not Confident to Act</b> The present report cannot be used with confidence. Though the methodology as such would be able to address the evaluation objectives, these objectives themselves are not sufficiently described in the report, nor is the purpose clearly provided The report focuses on the presentation of quantitative and qualitative data without providing sufficient analysis around the evaluation objectives. Conclusions are not made on the level of the these objectives and recommendations are not sufficiently grounded in conclusions and findings. The summary does not present the conclusions and recommendations very well and is thus of limited use for decision-making.
<b>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</b> The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	No	With most of the sections weak or very weak the report cannot be considered to be able to be improved with a bit of work and can thus not provide sufficient confidence to act.	
<b>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</b> This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	ToRs	The ToRs do not adequately define purpose, scope, and appropriate objectives. There is no questioning or clarification of this in the report, nor any discussion of evaluation criteria or standards by which 'effectiveness' (or impact) should be measured.	
	Other	A weak performance framework.	
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The present report cannot be used with confidence. Though the methodology as such would be able to address the evaluation objectives, these objectives themselves are not sufficiently described in the report, nor is the purpose clearly provided. The report focuses on the presentation of quantitative and qualitative data without providing sufficient analysis around the evaluation objectives. Conclusions are not made on the level of the objectives, and recommendations are not sufficiently grounded in conclusions and findings. The summary does not present the conclusions and recommendations very well and is thus of limited use for decision-making.</b>		