

EVALUATION ID 0000-2015-003

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

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

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

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#) [UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#) [UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | Response | | | | |
| Title of the Evaluation Report | Protecting Children from Violence: A Comprehensive Evaluation of UNICEF's Strategies and Programme Performance | | | | |
| Report sequence number | 2015-003 | Date of Review | 26-11-2015 | Year of the Evaluation Report | 2015 |
| Region | Corporate (HQ) | | Country | Global | |
| Type of Report | Evaluation | | TORs Present | Yes | |
| Name of reviewer | Universalia Management Group | | | | |
| | Classification of Evaluation Report | | | | Comments |
| Geographic Scope (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>) | 1.5 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. | | | | |
| Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>) | 2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation. | | | | |
| Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>) | 3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives | | | | |
| Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>) | 4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme | | | | |
| SPOA Correspondence (<i>Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action</i>) | 5.6 Child Protection: Supporting global efforts to prevent violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect through improved and equitable prevention and child protection systems. Programme areas: a) Child protection systems strengthening b) Violence, exploitation and abuse c) Justice for children d) Birth registration e) Strengthened families and communities f) Child protection in humanitarian situations | | | | The evaluation looks at UNICEF's VAC programming at the global level. This evaluation is accompanied by four country case studies to provide information on UNICEF's VAC programming. |
| Level of Independence (<i>Implementation and control of the evaluation activities</i>) | 6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated. | | | | |
| Approach | 7.3 Summative and formative: An evaluation that combines the elements of a formative and a summative evaluation. | | | | |

| SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION | | | | |
|--|--------|---|--|--|
| Question | cc | Remarks | | |
| Object and context | | | | |
| 1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached. | Yes | The object of the evaluation is well described from pp 3 - 5 and identifies the specific global policies and strategies that are relevant in the context of the evaluation. The description includes UNICEF's key results areas for the MTSP, CP Strategy, and SP 2014 - 2017. The degree of importance that VAC has within UNICEF is explicitly discussed on p. 2 and UNICEF's global financial contributions per programming area are outlined in annex 11. The context is well explained from pp 1 - 2 and includes information on international priorities, global statistics on VAC, potential effects of VAC, and challenges to strengthening the countries' child protection systems. Information provided on the context helps illuminate the findings. | A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate. | |
| 2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level | Yes | | | |
| 3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed. | Yes | | | |
| Theory of Change | | | | |
| 4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained. | Yes | The report presents an Evaluation Framework based MTSP targets and indicators, which outlines the results chain at the global level. The usage of a Theory of change model is discussed at the country level from pp. 29 and 30 and provides a discussion on how well countries are using ToC models to implement VAC programming. The report states that UNICEF does not have a Theory of Change model for VAC programming at the global level (p. 72). Pages 72 - 74 provide a description of the purpose of a ToC model and provide examples of how some countries have developed VAC programming ToC models that have helped them improve their M&E systems and planning processes. | Mostly Satisfactory | |
| Stakeholders and their contributions | | | | |
| 5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers | Mostly | A list of consulted stakeholders by country, regional office, and HQ is presented in annex 6. However, key stakeholders are not referenced in the body of the report. Although stakeholder contributions are implied throughout the findings, a clear description on stakeholder contributions is | | |
| 6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable | Mostly | | The report follows good practices by clearly describing the object of evaluation by providing information on specific global policies and strategies to be evaluated and by clearly identifying the importance (including financial weight) of VAC within UNICEF's global programming. Good practices are also followed by thoroughly describing the context of the evaluation by presenting international priorities, global statistics on VAC, potential effects of VAC, and challenges to strengthening the countries' child protection systems. Although UNICEF does not yet have a Theory of Change for VAC programming at the global level, the evaluation assessed the usage of a Theory of Change at the country level and structured the Evaluation Framework around MTSP targets and indicators. Best practices are demonstrated by not only providing information on the current programme implementation status but by also discussing the evolution of the formation of the key result areas for the MTSP focus area 4 in child protection thematic reports from 2008 - 2013. Although information on UNICEF contributions is provided throughout the findings, information | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p> | Mostly | <p>not provided. UNICEF contributions are described throughout the findings. However, a description of specific activities and inputs near the beginning of the report to help orientate the reader is missing. UNICEF's global financial contributions are presented in annex 11.</p> | | <p>programme is identified and the evolution of the formation of the key result areas for the MTSP focus area 4 in child protection thematic reports from 2008 - 2013 is outlined.</p> | <p>regarding the activities and inputs that UNICEF has contributed over the evaluation period would be useful to the reader if presented near the beginning of the report. Even though stakeholders are identified in annex 6, they should also be discussed within the body of the report and their specific contributions should be described and presented in a section near the beginning of the report.</p> |
| Implementation Status | | | | | |
| <p>8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes</p> | Outstanding | <p>The current implementation status of the programme is identified and the evolution of the formation of the key result areas for the MTSP focus area 4 in child protection thematic reports from 2008 - 2013 is outlined in chart format on p. 23.</p> | | | |
| <p>Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p> | <p>The evaluation report presents detailed information on the evaluated object and its context and is particularly strong at describing how key result areas for VAC have evolved over the evaluated period. More information on activities and inputs that UNICEF has contributed over the evaluation period and on how stakeholders have contributed to the programme would be useful near the beginning of the report.</p> | | | | |

| SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Question | cc | Remarks | | | |
| Purpose, objectives and scope | | | | | |
| <p>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</p> | Yes | <p>The purpose of the evaluation is well described on p. 2, where it is explained that UNICEF's advocacy and programme response to VAC has never been comprehensively evaluated and that further evaluation work was called for in 2012. The report explains that information related to UNICEF's performance in terms of reducing VAC will be used to strengthen UNICEF's VAC work and identifies which future strategies and programmes will benefit from the information. The evaluation objectives and scope are outlined on pp. 5 - 7 and evaluation questions are presented on p. 9 and 10.</p> | <p>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p> | |
| <p>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details</p> | Yes | | | | |
| <p>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)</p> | Yes | | | | |
| Evaluation framework | | | | | |
| <p>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p> | Yes | <p>The evaluation report provides evaluation questions on pp. 9 and 10 that are explicitly structured around the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The report specifies that the evaluation criteria were chosen according to the criteria outlined in the ToRs, which follows standard OECD/DAC requirements.</p> | Highly Satisfactory | <p>The evaluation purpose is well described and it is explained that UNICEF's advocacy and programme response to VAC has never been comprehensively evaluated and that further evaluation work was called for in 2012. The report explains that information related to UNICEF's performance in terms of reducing VAC will be used to strengthen UNICEF's VAC work and identifies which future strategies and programmes will benefit from the information. The evaluation objectives and clearly outlined and the scope of what is to be included and what will not be included in the evaluation is described in great detail from pp. 5 - 7. Evaluation questions are presented on p. 9 around the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.</p> | <p>The evaluation report is strong in clearly describing the evaluation's purpose and objectives. Additionally, it reflects good practices by clearly indicating what elements of violence will and will not be included in the evaluation scope. Good practices are followed by presenting the evaluation questions around the OECD/DAC criteria.</p> |
| <p>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.</p> | Yes | | | | |
| <p>Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p> | <p>The evaluation report is strong in clearly describing the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. Evaluation questions are presented around the OECD/DAC criteria.</p> | | | | |

| SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Question | cc | Remarks |
| Data collection | | |
| <p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p> | Yes | <p>The report indicates that 5 main methods were used to collect data, which include a document and literature review; consultations and key informant interviews; fieldwork in four countries; a desk study of 14 countries; and an online survey of UNICEF programme countries. The reasoning behind the selection of countries to be involved in the evaluation is provided on p.12, and the purposeful sampling selection of interviewees and focus group participants is presented on p. 13. An explanation of data analysis methods is provided on p. 15 and mentions that 5 main data analysis techniques were used, which include content analysis; comparative analysis; gap analysis; most significant change; and quantitative/statistical analysis. The report mentions that baseline data is generally missing (p. 18). Data sources according to sub-evaluation questions and indicators are presented in annex 3. An explanation is provided on p. 17 of how triangulation was used to ensure results accuracy, reduce bias, and make sure that a variety of voices were included in the report. Evaluation limitations are presented on pp. 18 and 19 and are appropriate for the task at hand.</p> |
| <p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p> | Yes | |
| Ethics | | |
| <p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p> | Yes | <p>The extent to which ethical considerations are implemented at the country level is analyzed on p. 48. Ethical considerations in terms of programme coverage and the participation of children in the programme's design and M&E system are presented throughout the report. The evaluation team made sure to include children's voices in the evaluation. Annex 8 provides a description of how ethical guidelines were implemented during the evaluation process, including the protection of confidentiality, rights, dignity and welfare of people, informed consent, and behaviour of evaluators. There is, however, of the ethical implications of engaging with children and addressing their specific needs.</p> |
| <p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p> | Yes | |
| Results Based Management | | |
| | | <p>The evaluation report presents a methodology that is appropriate, includes a</p> |
| | | <p>The evaluation report follows good practice by clearly describing the</p> |

C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?

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.

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

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</p> <p>The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p> | <p>Outstanding</p> | <p>The robustness of UNICEF's ability to gather and use data, monitor, research, and evaluate in terms of VAC programming is one of the main focuses of the evaluation (key result areas). The strengths and weaknesses of the M&E systems for VAC programming at the global, country and regional levels are discussed in great detail from pp. 66 - 77. The report found that although there is greater attention being paid to M&E tools for VAC programming, there are still significant gaps in terms of information and effective functioning of the M&E system particularly at the country and regional levels. The report uses UNICEF's global strategic indicators to present findings around key result areas from the MTSP.</p> | <p>methodology that is appropriate, includes a diversity of stakeholder viewpoints, and uses triangulation to ensure accuracy and reduce potential biases. The report clearly identifies data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods, sources of data, and potential evaluation limitations. The methodology can facilitate answers to the evaluation questions. The report specifically mentions that key baseline data is missing. Data collection tools are presented in the report's annexes. Ethical considerations are included throughout the report and are particularly discussed in annex 8. The report does an excellent job at analysing the programme's M&E system at the global, country and regional levels. The report also made appropriate use of the M&E framework through the development of the Evaluation Framework and demonstrates</p> | <p>practice by clearly describing the evaluation methodology, particularly how triangulation was used to reduce bias and by presenting evaluation limitations. The report is also strong at discussing ethical issues and stakeholder participation. The report is very strong in integrating human rights, gender equality, and equity issues throughout the report and in specific sections and reflects best practices particularly in its discussion around equity by providing information on identified sub-groups of particularly vulnerable children. Best practices can be seen in the way the report analyzed the programme's M&E system at the global, country, and regional levels. It also was also very strong at using the M&E system to create the Evaluation Framework and at presenting findings around the MTSP's key result areas</p> |
| <p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object?</p> <p>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> | <p>Outstanding</p> | <p>The robustness of UNICEF's ability to gather and use data, monitor, research, and evaluate in terms of VAC programming is one of the main focuses of the evaluation (key result areas). The strengths and weaknesses of the M&E systems for VAC programming at the global, country and regional levels are discussed in great detail from pp. 66 - 77. The report found that although there is greater attention being paid to M&E tools for VAC programming, there are still significant gaps in terms of information and effective functioning of the M&E system particularly at the country and regional levels. The report uses UNICEF's global strategic indicators to present findings around key result areas from the MTSP.</p> | <p>methodology that is appropriate, includes a diversity of stakeholder viewpoints, and uses triangulation to ensure accuracy and reduce potential biases. The report clearly identifies data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods, sources of data, and potential evaluation limitations. The methodology can facilitate answers to the evaluation questions. The report specifically mentions that key baseline data is missing. Data collection tools are presented in the report's annexes. Ethical considerations are included throughout the report and are particularly discussed in annex 8. The report does an excellent job at analysing the programme's M&E system at the global, country and regional levels. The report also made appropriate use of the M&E framework through the development of the Evaluation Framework and demonstrates</p> | <p>practice by clearly describing the evaluation methodology, particularly how triangulation was used to reduce bias and by presenting evaluation limitations. The report is also strong at discussing ethical issues and stakeholder participation. The report is very strong in integrating human rights, gender equality, and equity issues throughout the report and in specific sections and reflects best practices particularly in its discussion around equity by providing information on identified sub-groups of particularly vulnerable children. Best practices can be seen in the way the report analyzed the programme's M&E system at the global, country, and regional levels. It also was also very strong at using the M&E system to create the Evaluation Framework and at presenting findings around the MTSP's key result areas</p> |

| Human Rights, Gender and Equity | | | |
|--|-------------|--|---|
| <p>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?</p> <p>This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority. To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.</p> | Yes | <p>The evaluation design and style incorporates a commitment to a human-rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity. Human-rights language and gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing was used throughout the document. One of seven evaluation questions is dedicated to these cross-cutting issues. Additionally, children were included in evaluation interviews. A specific section is dedicated to findings related to human rights, gender equality, and equity from pp. 85 - 96 and these issues are present in the report's conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the programme was monitored through human rights frameworks, discussing the inclusion of children's voices in VAC-programming. GEEW-specific concerns are raised throughout the report and data is disaggregated wherever possible. The report demonstrates best practices by providing a dedicated findings section on equity and human rights where an analysis of the programme is broken down by vulnerable sub-group (children with disabilities, those in conflict with the law, and by age and socio-economic category).</p> | <p>evaluation framework and demonstrates best practices by structuring evaluation findings around results areas based on the programme's MTSP. Cross-cutting issues including human rights, gender equality, and equity are addressed throughout the entire report and within dedicated sections. The report demonstrates best practices in its analysis of equity by providing information on identified sub-groups of particularly vulnerable children. Stakeholder participation is well described in the acknowledgements section near the beginning of the report.</p> |
| <p>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks?</p> <p>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> | Yes | | |
| <p>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?</p> <p>The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.</p> | Yes | | |
| <p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</p> <p>The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p> | Yes | | |
| <p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</p> <p>The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.</p> | Outstanding | | |

Highly Satisfactory

| Stakeholder participation | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p> | Yes | The evaluation specifies that the draft reports, inception report, and synthesis reports were reviewed by an inter-divisional advisory group. It also identifies the actors involved in managing the evaluation process. Due to the scale of this evaluation, it seems reasonable that direct beneficiaries (apart from the advisory group) such as children and community members were not included in the development of the reports. The active participation of the advisory group seems to be an appropriate level of stakeholder participation. |
| <p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p> | Yes | |
| Methodological robustness | | |
| <p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p> | N/A | Due to the fact that the evaluation looks at UNICEF's global VAC programming, it is impossible to provide a counterfactual. The methodology is based on a mixed methods approach that includes 5 different types of data collection methods that looks at VAC programming in countries from around the globe. The methodology is suited to provide useful answers to the evaluation questions. Methodological limitations are presented on p. 18. The report specifies that the limitations "have been successfully tackled". |
| <p>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p> | Yes | The one limitation that appears to be most important is that of missing baseline data. However, the evaluation methodology compensates for this lack of data by extensively gathering quantitative data through interviews and focus groups. |
| <p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p> | Yes | |
| <p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p> | <p>The evaluation report presents a methodology that is appropriate, includes a diversity of stakeholder viewpoints, and uses triangulation to ensure accuracy and reduce potential biases. The report is particularly strong in its assessment of the programme's M&E Framework and in including human rights, gender equality, and equity issues throughout the report.</p> | |

| SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS | | | |
|---|-------------|--|---|
| Question | cc | Remarks | |
| Completeness and logic of findings | | | |
| 30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias. | Outstanding | Findings demonstrate best practices in their clarity of presentation and their objective use of reported evidence. Each major finding section presents the corresponding evaluation question, a definition of the evaluation criteria, any related expected results and a summary of the key findings (including strengths and weaknesses) in a synthesized text box at the beginning of the section. The section then goes on to assess the extent to which the expected results have been achieved and presents evidence to answer the evaluation question. This clearly demonstrate the progression to results based on the reported evidence. The findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria. The effects of evaluation limitations are discussed throughout the findings to provide guidance to the reader on how to interpret the findings. Although unexpected findings are discussed throughout, they are not clearly identified and could benefit from being presented in a distinct sub-section. | D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation. |
| 31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report. | Yes | | |
| 32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results. | Outstanding | | |
| 33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed. | Yes | | |
| 34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications. | Mostly | | |
| Cost Analysis | | | |
| 35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme. | Yes | UNICEF expenditures on child protection from violence, exploitation, and abuse are presented by key results area from 2009 - 2013 on p. 99. The report explains that it is difficult to identify cost per beneficiary since VAC funding is often not distinguished from overall child protection funding (p. 101). It goes on to identify flexible approaches to programming that serve as some of the most efficient ways to get results (p. 101). Figures on p. 102 provide information on how funding was spent compared to alternatives. Questions around sustainability and scaling up are discussed from pp. 108 - 112. | Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i> |

| Contribution and causality | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p> | Mostly | <p>The contributions of different stakeholders are not clearly described in the report. Therefore, assigning contribution for results to identified stakeholders is problematic throughout the evaluation. However, the report does a good job at describing UNICEF's contributions throughout the findings and discussing the reasons for accomplishments and failures. A dedicated section on stakeholders and their contributions could help clarify their roles and what results they are responsible for.</p> |
| <p>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p> | Yes | |
| Strengths, weaknesses and implications | | |
| <p>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p> | Yes | <p>The conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object. Future implications of continuing constraints are discussed, specifically the effect of low resource allocation to VAC in meeting UNICEF's goal to "end abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children".</p> |
| <p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p> | Yes | |
| Completeness and insight of conclusions | | |
| <p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p> | Yes | <p>The conclusions go beyond the findings and identify important issues and priority areas. The conclusions reflect the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders, including children. The evaluation methodology was extensive in coverage and included hundreds of diverse voices. The conclusions are pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation. In fact, the report demonstrates best practices by structuring the conclusions around the OECD/VAC criteria and key MTSP result areas. The conclusions are particularly accessible due to the fact that each section has a highlighted key conclusion, which provides guidance to the reader in a snapshot format.</p> |
| <p>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p> | Yes | |
| <p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p> | Outstanding | |
| <p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p> | <p>The findings are based on evidence and the conclusions provide clear insights into important issues. The report is exceptionally strong at demonstrating progression to results, yet is weak in assigning responsibility for results to stakeholders other than UNICEF.</p> | |

Highly Satisfactory

| SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED | | | |
|---|-------------|--|---|
| Question | cc | Remarks | |
| Relevance and clarity of recommendations | | | |
| 43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report. | Yes | Recommendations are presented from pp 118-121 and are well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported; are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation; and are clearly stated and numerically prioritized. The level of importance of each recommendation is further emphasized by providing a priority level status (i.e. very high or high). | E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up. |
| 44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object | Yes | | |
| 45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority. | Outstanding | | |
| Usefulness of recommendations | | | |
| 46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic. | Outstanding | The recommendations are realistic and demonstrate a good understanding of the context of the evaluation and a strong thematic understanding on behalf of the evaluation team. Each recommendation specifically identifies the key entities by specific position (i.e. Director of the Division of Communication) that are responsible for implementing the recommendation. This reflects best practices. The evaluation specifies in the acknowledgments section near the beginning of the report that the draft report was reviewed by members of an inter-divisional advisory group (at the international level). Therefore, the recommendations were likely developed in collaboration with this group. However, the process followed in developing the recommendations should be explicitly mentioned at the beginning of the recommendations section. | Mostly Satisfactory The recommendations are well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported; are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation; are realistic, and are clearly stated and numerically prioritized. The level of importance of each recommendation is further emphasized by providing a priority level status (i.e. very high or high). They demonstrate best practices by specifically identifying the key entities by specific position (i.e. Director of the Division of Communication) that are responsible for implementing the recommendation. Although the recommendations appear to have been developed in consultation with a group of relevant stakeholders, the processes followed in developing the recommendations should be explicitly outlined before the recommendations are presented. Although the ToRs and the evaluation objectives state that part of the purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons for learning, there are no explicit lessons learned presented in the report. |
| 47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes | Yes | | |
| 48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility. | Yes | | |
| Appropriate lessons learned | | | |
| 49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned. | No | Although the ToRs and the evaluation objectives state that part of the purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons for learning, there are no explicit lessons learned presented in the report. | The report reflects best practices by prioritizing recommendations, identifying priority level status, and by specifically identifying the key entities by specific position (i.e. Director of the Division of Communication) that are responsible for implementing the recommendation. Although the report implies that the recommendations were developed in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, a more explicit description of how this process occurred should be presented near the beginning of the recommendations section. Although the ToRs and the evaluation objectives state that part of the purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons for learning, there are no explicit lessons learned presented in the report. A section dedicated to correctly identified lessons learned should therefore be included after the conclusions section. |
| 50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object. | No | | |

Executive Feedback on Section E

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

Up to two sentences

The recommendations are prioritized, identify the target group for action, and appear to have been developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Even though the ToRs and the evaluation objectives state that part of the purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons for learning, there are no explicit lessons learned presented in the report.

| SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Question | cc | Remarks | F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? | Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i> | | |
| Style and presentation | | | | | | |
| 51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms | Yes | The opening pages contain all of the basic elements and the report is logically structured with sections clearly labelled and in the right order. The report demonstrates best practices by presenting the appropriate evaluation questions at the beginning of each findings section and goes above and beyond by providing a snapshot summary of key findings, strengths, and areas for improvement. Appendices include documents such as the ToRs, a list of consulted stakeholders, methodological tools, information on ethics, and information on UNICEF financial flows, among others. Information that is missing from the annexes that could be useful would be information on the qualifications of the evaluation team. | Highly Satisfactory | The report reflects good practices through its logical and coherent structure and succinct writing style. It includes an exceptionally strong Executive Summary that provides succinct information on the evaluation's main points and priorities and will therefore be very useful to decision-makers. Although the appendices include crucial information such as the ToRs, a list of consulted stakeholders, methodological tools, information on ethics, and information on UNICEF financial flows, the credibility of the report could be strengthened by including information on the qualifications of the evaluation team. | | |
| 52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt | Outstanding | | | | | |
| 53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report | Yes | | | | | |
| 54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report? | Yes | | | | | |
| Executive Summary | | | | | | |
| 55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A | Yes | Although the Executive Summary is somewhat long (7 pages), it is succinctly written and provides a very clear description of all of the necessary elements including the evaluation purpose, evaluation objectives, programming context, methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. | | | | |
| 56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations | Outstanding | | | | | |
| 57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments | Yes | The conclusions and recommendations are written in a format using clear sub-sections and relevant titles that truly facilitates an understanding of the evaluation's main points and key priorities. The Executive Summary can stand alone and will be very useful to decision-makers. It is also presented in both Spanish and French. | | | | |
| 58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities. | Outstanding | | | | | |
| Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i> | The report is logically structured and includes an exceptionally strong Executive Summary that provides succinct information on the evaluation's main points and priorities and will therefore be very useful to decision-makers. The annexes contain useful information that enhance the credibility of the report. | | | | | |
| Additional Information | | | | | | |
| Question | Remarks | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p> | <p>Mostly. The evaluation methodology, evaluation framework, evaluation criteria, and structure of the report all successfully address the Terms of Reference. However, the ToRs state that part of the purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons for learning and yet there are no explicit lessons learned presented in the report.</p> | | |
| <p>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation</p> | <p>The evaluation is particularly strong in its evaluation of the programme's M&E system. It is also very strong in relation to using the M&E system to create the Evaluation Framework and structuring the report's findings around key results areas. The structure and writing style of the report is exceptionally strong and provides clarity that is very useful to decision-making, particularly in the conclusions, recommendations, and the Executive Summary.</p> | | |
| <p>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p> | <p>The evaluation team demonstrated excellent knowledge of issues surrounding VAC and demonstrated best practices in its ability to assess the programme's reach in terms of equity by discussing sub-groups of marginalized children.</p> | | |
| OVERALL RATING | | | |
| <p>Question</p> | <p>cc</p> | <p>Remarks</p> | <p>OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p> |
| <p>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>The six sections of the evaluation are well written; provide detailed information; are based on an appropriate methodology; and link together nicely in a logical and coherent report. The analysis, findings, conclusions, and recommendations hold together very well.</p> | <p>Highly Satisfactory</p> <p>This is a credible evaluation report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence and can be used with confidence. Evaluation limitations encountered are transparently described and efforts to mitigate them are presented. The methodology is sound, the findings are based on evidence, the conclusions provide exceptionally good insight into important issues, and the recommendations are realistic, prioritized, and targeted. Areas for improvement include clearly describing the contributions of stakeholders and how they affect results, highlighting unexpected findings, and identifying lessons learned.</p> |
| <p>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>The report's structure and content are logical and present a bigger picture that provides common threads throughout the report.</p> | |
| <p>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p> | <p>ToRs</p> | | |
| | <p>Other</p> | <p>The report identified an evaluation limitation as having limited access to statistical information on VAC. This is indeed a major limitation. However, the evaluation team mitigated this problem by focusing on qualitative data gathered through key information interviews and focus groups within four case-study countries.</p> | |
| <p>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p> | <p>The methodology is sound, the findings are based on evidence, the conclusions provide insight into important issues, and the recommendations are realistic, prioritized, and targeted. Further effort needs to be made to attribute results to stakeholder contributions and provide lessons learned.</p> | | |