Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation
The Evaluation of Adolescents Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Pilot

Sequence No 2018/001
Region ECAR
Office Kazakhstan
Coverage Kazakhstan
Evaluation Type Pilot/innovation
Year of Report 2018

OVERALL RATING
• • • - Satisfactory

Implications:
Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

• • • - Satisfactory
The background section is complete and provides all of the required elements. The program is well explained, mostly in section 4 (Theory of change) and develops the rationale of the model tested. The expected results and their causal links are clear, although the logical framework does not include clear indicators quantifying the results. The context section does a good job of setting the framework of the problem to be addressed in the country (section 1.3) and at explaining why Kazakhstan needs to work on a viable model to deal with this problem, including the Policy context (section 4.2.3. in page 41). It also includes a section on how this thematic area fits within the priorities of the overall Country Programme (section 1.2 and 1.4). The stakeholders are identified in section "Implementing partners of the ASP pilot" within the scope section on page 19 and their roles are clearly explained.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

• • • • Highly Satisfactory
The report presents with clarity why the evaluation is taking place, how the results are planned to be used, and who will be the primary and secondary users of the evaluation. Objectives (what the evaluation precisely tried to get as results) and the scope (limits to what was evaluated, described by several dimensions) are also discussed and help the reader get a clear idea of the rationale of the exercise.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

• • • • Highly Satisfactory
The report shows how the evaluation team has solid evaluation-specific knowledge and clearly presents the methodological choices that shaped the evaluation. The evaluation questions and the design (mix of theory-based and utilisation-focused) are clearly described and justified. An interesting table (Table 3 on page 27) maps the data types and sources with how they were used for the evaluation. Methods are discussed and analysis techniques and rationales are largely discussed, which increases the transparency of the evaluative thinking that is central to the evaluative process. Limitations are self-assessed and ethical considerations are covered in a satisfactory manner. Finally, the report also includes a very interesting table on the reliability of the evidence that was available to answer all of the key evaluation questions (page 22).

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Highly Satisfactory

The findings section responds to all of the key evaluation questions with clarity (lower level subtitles help to identify the questions discussed), disaggregating the answers to the questions into different sub-elements. Evidence presented has multiple layers (quantitative and qualitative), and the report presents both positive and negative findings. Unintended effects are also explored. Causal factors are discussed and the report presents hypotheses of potential causes.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The conclusions in the report are elaborated and presented in an incomplete manner. Section 6. Key Learnings from the ASP include conclusions only about the effectiveness criterion. Later, some lessons learned are presented and then some conclusions about scalability are presented. Conclusions concerning the other evaluation criteria are not included. Lessons learned are appropriately presented and discussed.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The recommendation section presents value in the form of forward-looking actions to improve the future development of the ASP programme (which is currently being rolled out at national level by the Government). The report explains their process of elaboration, they are derived from the findings, and they present the stakeholders to which they are addressed. They are presented in order of priority but more detail around implementation delays and the level of critical relevance of each recommendation would reinforce this section.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
While the report does not utterly follow a classical structure for evaluation reports (as suggested in UNICEF Evaluation report guidelines), it does follow a clear and logical structure. The report's opening pages contain all of the required information and the annexes are complete and add additional credibility to the report.

**SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)**

**Satisfactory**

The report demonstrates how cross-cutting issues were taken into account throughout the evaluation process. From mentioning human rights frameworks guiding the process (such as UNICEF’s ‘Seven Principles of a Child Rights’ Approach’), to clearly describing the rationale and inclusion of participation in the evaluation, along with mainstreaming the equity and gender analysis along the different evaluation phases, this report is a benchmark on how to incorporate equity and gender issues as cross-cutting dimensions that permeate the evaluation exercise. This being said, the sex of the evaluation participants is not identified (this information is not present in table 4 or in the specific annex 4).

**SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)**

**Satisfactory**

The executive summary is nicely written and helps the reader obtain a good idea of the evaluation process and key messages. It is concise and captures key elements of each section (context, object, methodology, findings and recommendations). However, all 14 recommendations are presented, which is considered slightly too exhaustive for an executive summary.

**Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?**

| 9 | Meets requirements |

**Recommendations for improvement**

This is a good quality report that provides relevant evidence and a strong analysis to inform future implementation and potential scaling-up of the model. Although not completely structured according to UNICEF guidelines (example, the object is usually discussed before the methodology), it includes all elements and demonstrates the evaluators’ evaluation-specific knowledge and competencies. The evaluation framework and design are defined and justified within the evaluation context, participation involving stakeholders throughout the evaluation process is articulated, and gender and equity concerns have been mainstreamed throughout the evaluation process and report, as required by UNICEF. In order to reinforce the report, it should have included a more systematic elaboration of conclusions (for all evaluation criteria, rather than just effectiveness and scalability).

**Lessons for managing future evaluations:**

The expected results would be clearer if the reconstructed theory of change had included the indicators (or progress markers as the report calls them) when explaining it. Also, more precise detail of the pilot dimensions (including a map with locations of schools) could reinforce this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required. However, a minor idea to reinforce this section would be to slightly rearrange some of the information by sections and subsections (example: primary and secondary users are presented after the scope, and they would be more naturally presented after the purpose, before the objectives).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required. However, a suggestion to make the report more reader-friendly could be to split Table 2 on page 22 into two; first presenting the evaluation criteria and questions (this is the first time they are introduced in the report) and secondly, to include the assessment of the level of evidence available to answer them, instead of introducing both things at the same time. Also, the sampling process could have included the total population size of each category (example: total number of schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required. However, the section could be reinforced if some of the quantitative data presented in tables were on occasion presented in graphs so as to facilitate its reading (Example: those including male and female like in tables 7, 8 and 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>This section could be improved by including a summary and analytical assessment of the findings of each of the key evaluation questions covering all of the evaluation criteria, rather than merely presenting conclusions regarding effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Beyond being ranked by priority, the recommendations could be strengthened by describing how critical each one is, how long it would take to implement each one, and the ideal timeframe for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The report would better comply with UNICEF standards if it followed a more straightforward structure (i.e. Background, Evaluation object, Evaluation purpose and design, findings by criteria, conclusions and recommendations). Providing guidance on the desired report structure to the evaluators may be useful to ensure that it is structured using a standard format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required. However, it would add further value to the report to identify the sex of the evaluation participants (this information is not present in table 4 or in the specific annex 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>The executive summary would be more concise if it presented only the most relevant recommendations or a summary of the 14 ones included, instead of all of them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>