



## 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>Rapport d'Evaluation, Méthode ASAMA</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2011-001
<b>Date of Review</b>	27/04/2012
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2011
<b>Region</b>	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Madagascar
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation
<b>TORs Present</b>	Yes
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	<b>IOD PARC</b>
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
<b>Geographical</b> <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country
<b>Management</b> <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.5 Not clear from Report
<b>Purpose</b> <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes
<b>Result</b> <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
<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 (2. Basic education & gender equality)
<b>Level of Independence</b> <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.
<b>Timing / Stage</b>	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme

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 'context of evaluation' is understood in this report as the context of the evaluation itself and not the socio-economic context within which the intervention happens; the details provided about the intervention focus more on explaining the pedagogical approach used in the intervention than explaining what the project did and how. Some information about the Malagasy context is provided half way through the report and it does to a certain extent help to understand the relevance of the intervention; but this context is not referred to during the data analysis.	<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 & priorities, as appropriate.	
<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.	No	No information is provided	<b>Not Confident to Act</b> The report provides limited information about the context and the justification for the intervention. The Theory of Change is not articulated. Not enough information is provided to explain how the pedagogical method has been implemented, and who is involved and in what way. We can't see whether this is a pedagogical method which has been disseminated through the normal state channels with the help of other actors or whether some service providers/NGOs have created special education centres with dedicated staff to test the method over a number of years.	
<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	No	The report refers to donors, partners, associations, and NGOs but never names them nor explains clearly their roles or how they interact with each other. It is not clear whether this is an initiative linked to one state actor or a civil society actor? There is mention of the implementing agency which is mentioned more as a service provider.		It is important for the evaluation report to include all the relevant information about the social economic and political context of the project upfront in the report so as to explain the logic and relevance of the project/programme within the national context. It is also necessary to have all the details about the object being evaluated. This information is also necessary later on to assess the methodology of the evaluation.
<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			
<b>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Almost			
<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	No	Not enough information is provided to explain how the method has been implemented, and how and who is involved and in what way.		
<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 report provides limited information about the context and the justification for the intervention. The actors involved and the role they play in the intervention are not sufficiently visible in the report.</b>			

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.	Almost	The report provides only basic information about the objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation seems to have two purposes: to assess results and to conduct a feasibility on scaling up, but the report does not elaborate on who commissioned the evaluation and who will use the results.	<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>	Almost	In the executive summary there is a list of criteria, some of which (relevance, effectiveness and sustainability) are part of the DAC list. There is however no mention in the report itself of the criteria and no explanation about how the criteria were chosen; there are also a number of criteria, such as for example, 'management', 'implementation' or 'pedagogical approach' which are not criteria.	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	The purpose of the evaluation is not clearly defined and it is not clear 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 includes the objectives of the evaluation but is vague about the main evaluation questions. The report describes the chosen evaluation criteria but does not explain the rationale behind the choice and some criteria are more issues to investigate than criteria in themselves.	Methodologically the choice of criteria should be informed by the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and should inform the choice of information needed to answer the evaluation questions. The link between these steps has to be made clear so as to make explicit the logic followed in the evaluation process.
<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 report does include some information about objectives and criteria for evaluation, but no clear information on the purpose. The links/rationale between criteria and objectives is not always made sufficiently explicit.</b>				

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Data collection</b>				<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<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>	No	<p>The report provides only extremely basic information about how the data was collected and where (we only know that the team used qualitative and quantitative methods). There is no explanation about how the visited villages were chosen, nor how respondents were selected or how many. We are only given a total figure of respondents and we don't know who these were (beneficiaries and their parents? staff?) and in which proportion.</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>Though the report does mention early on that the evaluation uses a gender lens, there is no indication of a gender lens in the methodology.</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>	No	<p>The report makes no mention of ethical safeguards applied during the design of the methodology or the data collection.</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			
<b>Results Based Management</b>			<b>Not Confident to Act</b>	
<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>The report does mention that the project has not maintained a monitoring system and there is very limited information available about the project, how it was implemented and about its results. Overall very little information was provided to the evaluation team.</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>	No			
<b>Human Rights, Gender and Equity</b>				

<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>	No	<p>Though the report does mention early on that the evaluation is conducted through a gender lens, there is no indication in the methodology about how this gender lens was applied, either in terms of questions asked, the disaggregation of data or the nature of the questions themselves. There is no mention of a Human Rights framework.</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>	Almost	
<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>	No	
<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>	No	
<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	
<p><b>Stakeholder participation</b></p>		

<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	The methodology section provides no information about the stakeholders and their role in the evaluation; it is therefore difficult to assess their level and the relevance of their participation.	
<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>	No		
<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	Given the limited information provided about the methodology and what was done it is difficult to draw conclusions about the level of robustness. The confusion about the difference between evaluation criteria and themes or issues to evaluate or the lack of information about stakeholders and their level of representation are not encouraging signs of robustness. The report does however mention the use of qualitative and quantitative methods which are relevant.	
<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>	Almost		
<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>	Almost		
<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>The report does not include enough information about the methodology and the rationale behind the choices. It is difficult to assess whether the approach was not robust or whether we simply lack information.</b></p>		

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>				
<p><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.</p>	Almost	The report does include some data together with some explanation but it is not always clear from where the data comes. Is it the result of data collected by the team or taken from a project report? The information is rarely attributed to a specific source and there is no clear distinction between information emerging from the qualitative or the quantitative methods used.	<p><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.</p>	
<p><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.</p>	Yes			<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><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.</p>	Almost			
<p><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.</p>	Almost			
<p><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.</p>	Almost			
<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>	Yes	There is an attempt to conduct a cost analysis and to discuss differences, for example between centres, and between what was spent and what was initially planned.	<p><b>Almost Confident to Act</b></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>	No	Whilst there is some vague reference to some groups of respondents for some answers, it is not clear most of the time where the information comes from nor how much certain positions/answers presented in the report are representative; it also feels as if some actors have been silent as their views are not represented (such as for example, the state or the donors). Outcomes are reported rather than deeply analysed.		
<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>	Almost			

<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>	<p>Almost</p>				
<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>	<p>Almost</p>	<p>The weighting of strengths and weaknesses is not done systematically and the report tends to emphasise positive outcomes or mention limitations rather than reflect on strengths and weaknesses as such.</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>	<p>No</p>				
<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>	<p>No</p>	<p>The conclusion section is short and more a summary for the evaluation than a series of constructive concluding statements offering insights.</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>	<p>No</p>				
<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 data presented is relevant to the evaluation criteria and addresses all the criteria. The data is not sufficiently attributed to clearly identified sources and the conclusions do not reflect sufficiently on strengths and weaknesses.</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	The recommendations are relevant to the evaluations and to some of the findings but they are not prioritised are not sufficiently grounded in findings and not specific enough.	<b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> Recommendations should be relevant 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	For example what is a 'better management system' or a 'more efficient financing mechanism'? These would need to be specifically elaborated on to be actionable.		
<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.	No			
<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.	No	Since the report is not explicitly about the client or the audience of the evaluation the recommendations are not targeted and not actionable. The report also does not explain enough how these recommendations emerged.	<b>Not Confident to Act</b>	The recommendations should not be a long list of ideas to put into practice, such as a generic wish list. It should be clear in the report which specific problem shortcoming can be dealt with by which action, who should carry it out and how urgently; there should also be some consideration about what constraints (resource or structures ..) may hinder the implementation of a recommendation. Only then can management act with confidence.
<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.	Almost	The report does attempt to draw lessons but these are not grounded explicitly and some remain vague.		
<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>Some of the recommendations could be relevant to the evaluation, but they are not explicitly supported by evidence and conclusions. Many of these are also vague and would need to be elaborated on before being actionable.</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	Yes	The information about the educational method under investigation and about the national context is provided after the methodology section. The information in annex does provide useful insight on the methodology.		
<b>52 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	No			
<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	Yes			
<b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes			
<b>Executive Summary</b>			Almost Confident to Act	The executive summary should include all the information necessary to assess the quality and the logic of the evaluation. The reader should be given the essential elements of the context and the programme itself up front and enough details to assess the quality of the methodology (including tools used and sampling). The executive summary should also include conclusions and lessons learnt and recommendations should be targeted, prioritised and implementable.
<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 does not include sufficient information. For example there is no clear indication about who commissioned the evaluation or who will use the results, the information about the methodology is insufficient, the choice of criteria is not explained and it is not always easy to distinguish between results, findings and lessons.		
<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>Overall the report includes most of the expected information but it is not organised logically. The executive summary cannot be a standalone document informing decision making.</b>			
<b>Additional Information</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Remarks</b>			
<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	The report only partially addresses the ToRs because the methodology is not sufficiently robust and the answers provided to the evaluation questions are not sufficiently grounded in evidence.			
<b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation	good geographical spread of fields for data collection			

**iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation**

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise

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?	No	The information provided on the methodology is insufficient to assess with certainty the robustness of the data collection; the confusion between criteria to guide the evaluation and the issues to focus on creates more confusion. The links between data, findings and recommendation are not sufficiently explicit. Information about the project is too limited to fully understand the roles played by different stakeholders.	Not Confident to Act	This report would need much more work to be credible: the team probably collected more useful data than is presented and discussed in the report and there is probably more scope to use collected data to explore/explain some of the results. As it stands the report provides an overview of the situation after a decade of implementing/testing a specific pedagogical approach which seems to be promising to address the needs of a specific group of learners. But much more analysis is needed to understand the differentiated results emerging from the data.
<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	The structure is not totally logical: information about the project and the context comes after the methodology.		
<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	More guiding and explicit evaluation questions may have helped.		
	Other	Some confusion as to what can be considered as a criteria for an evaluation.		
<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>This report cannot be used with confidence. It would need much more work to be credible and much more analysis is needed to understand the differentiated results emerging from the data and to link these to specific recommendations.</b>			