Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation: End of Programme Evaluation on Promoting Child Rights in Cotton Farming Areas (CRCFA) Programme of Pakistan

Sequence No: 2018/002
Region: ROSA
Office: Pakistan
Coverage: Pakistan
Evaluation Type: Programme
Year of Report: 2018

OVERALL RATING

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

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The background section provides a good overview of the situation of the cotton-growing regions in Pakistan. Additionally, the report provides a good description of the "Promoting Child Rights in Cotton-Farming Areas of Pakistan" (CRCFA), including its timeframe, geographic scope, and budget. However, the report does not provide any details about the phases or timeline of activities. While beneficiaries and their needs are identified, the report lacks some specificity and detail in this regard. On the other hand, the report clearly describes the outcomes and outputs of the programme, and presents in a diagram format a theory of change that links output to outcome level results. Furthermore, the background section identifies key partners and their specific roles in implementation are described. However, UNICEF’s contributions to the programme are not clearly outlined. Finally, the report explains the relative importance of the programme to UNICEF.

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

Highly Satisfactory
The report clearly identifies the evaluation purpose, its objectives, as well as the timeframe and geographic areas covered by the evaluation. Furthermore, section 1.1 "Intended Users of the Report" outlines its primary users and how they are planning to use the results of the evaluation.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
The evaluation uses a pre/post design combined with a mixed-methods approach that draws on the perspectives of a variety of stakeholder groups. However, a justification for the use of this design as opposed to another to meet the evaluation objectives is not provided. The report does a good job of describing data sources and data collection methods. Additionally, the report clearly explains the sampling strategy used to select survey respondents. While the evaluators present the analytical framework of the evaluation, a description of the data analysis tools and methods used in the evaluation is missing. Finally, the report clearly explains the ethical safeguards adopted by the evaluators, and the report explicitly mentions the ethical obligations of evaluators.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Fair

The evaluation addresses most, but not all, evaluation questions. For example, regarding the 4 Efficacy questions, section 5.2 only answers 3 questions but skips question iv. "Did the programme reach out to vulnerable and deprived target populations". Additionally, the findings do not provide a thorough, deep discussion around several issues (example: the discussion around efficiency is very light). The report also does not provide sufficient analysis of the monitoring framework and system, does not consistently frame the findings in reference to the intervention logic, and does not provide sufficient discussion around causal factors. Also, the evaluation is not strong at presenting the nuanced perspectives of different stakeholder groups. For instance, information on the cross-cutting issues in section 5.5 treat communities as a whole - without going deeper into disaggregating which groups (by sex, age, or any other variable) answer differently than the majority.

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

Fair

The conclusions are scattered at the end of each findings section (not in section 6), so they are linked to the findings but they are rather simplistic (example in 5.4: "Conclusion: The programme has been successful in increasing capacity of various government staff through training initiatives under the programme"), and incomplete and do not provide a complete summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. They also do not provide forward-looking insights on the implication of the findings for the future. On the other hand, the report includes a section on lessons learned where most (but not all) contribute to general knowledge and can be applied to improve similar programming in wider contexts. Challenges are discussed in the lessons learned section, which is good practice. Finally, key aspects and outcomes are rated (against the evaluation criteria) at the beginning of the section, which is interesting but seems to be insufficiently explained, developed and justified.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
Recommendations derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions and most of them are actionable. While some recommendations are targeted at specific users (section 7.1.), other recommendations (sections 7.2. and 7.3) are organized by outcomes and not clearly targeted (7.2. could be targeted for UNICEF and 7.3 just for the government but this is not clear). On the other hand, recommendations are prioritized. Finally, the report explains that recommendations were developed following a participatory process involving stakeholders.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The opening pages present relevant information such as the name and location of the evaluated object, as well as the names of the evaluators and that of the commissioning organisations. Additionally, the opening pages include a table of contents and a list of acronyms. As for the annexes, they include relevant elements that add credibility to the evaluation such as: TOR, data collection tools, information about the evaluators, etc. Finally, the sections of the report follow a logical structure. However, some findings like unexpected outcomes are found in the conclusions section 6 and conclusions are scattered throughout the findings section 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation is generally weak at integrating equity issues and does not provide a thorough assessment of the extent to which the programme has responded to the needs of different groups. The report mostly lacks sex and age-disaggregated data and does not generally present the nuanced perspectives of women and men who were consulted. While gender and equity are mostly addressed under a standalone criterion in the evaluation matrix, the findings do not present a very strong gender and equity analysis. Additionally, the report does not explain whether any methodological tools were developed in a gender sensitive manner. Furthermore, while the evaluation adopts human rights language, it does not make clear reference to a human rights framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The executive summary presents most of the key messages of the evaluation report and is written in a concise manner, thereby ensuring its accessibility to its audience. However, it does not provide enough explanatory information relating to the findings. Also, conclusions are not clearly presented (they appear to be merged with findings), nor are the recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 4 | Approaches requirements |

Recommendations for improvement
The evaluation uses a pre/post, mixed-methods approach that draws on the perspectives of a variety of stakeholder groups, in particularly households from 106 of the +2000 villages where the programme was implemented. However, the methodological design is not particularly well justified about why this design was chosen. For future evaluations, the evaluation manager could brainstorm with the evaluation team alternative methodological approaches that would allow measuring achievement with greater certainty despite the lack of baseline data. Additionally, the evaluation manager could carefully go through the evaluation matrix when providing feedback on the report to ensure that all evaluation questions have been answered in a rigorous manner. It is also advisable for the evaluation manager to ensure that conclusions provide analytical value and are forward-looking and that recommendations are clearly targeted to each group. The evaluation manager should also ensure that the Executive Summary clearly identify the conclusions and recommendations, as they are key elements for decision-makers.

Lessons for managing future evaluations:

Section A
The report could be improved by outlining UNICEF’s specific role and contributions towards the programme; by providing more detailed and disaggregated information about the beneficiaries; and by providing details about the phases or timeline of activities.

Section B
This section reflects good practices. No further improvements are required.

Section C
GEROS standards require evaluations to not only describe the selected evaluation design but to also provide a justification for why the selected design was appropriate to meet the evaluation objectives. Furthermore, evaluation reports must describe how data was analysed. For more information on how to do this, please see: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/rainbow_framework/describe/analyse_data

Section D
To ensure that the evaluation answers all evaluation questions, these questions could be reiterated throughout the findings section. Additionally, the quality of the report could be improved by including a deeper analysis with references to sources when discussing findings and by further disaggregating answers by relevant variables (rather than treating the communities as an homogeneous universe). GEROS standards require evaluations to provide a strong analysis around the causal factors that have led to the achievement or unachievement of results. The strengths and areas for improvement of the programme’s monitoring system should be assessed and this should include a discussion around the extent to which it was used to inform decision-making. While unexpected outcomes are identified, they should be presented in the findings section.

Section E
The report could be further improved by gathering all of the conclusions and placing them in one dedicated section (in this case, section 6). They should be rewritten to raise the level of analysis beyond a summary of the findings so that they are forward looking and can provide insights around the implications of the findings for the future. Furthermore, the lessons learned should be reviewed to ensure that they are all properly identified and contribute to greater knowledge. While the rating of the key aspects and outcomes is interesting, it should be further developed and justified, and could even be included in the executive summary if validated by stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section F</th>
<th>The recommendations could be improved by ensuring that each recommendation includes enough detail and clarifies the lines of accountability regarding the implementation of each one, as it is important that all recommendations be clearly targeted at specific users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section G</td>
<td>The overall flow of the report could be improved by ensuring that content is properly found in each section (all findings in section 5 and all conclusions in section 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section H</td>
<td>The report could be improved by ensuring that gender equality considerations are mainstreamed throughout all evaluation questions (or at least their indicators) and that the gender analysis is reflected more strongly in the conclusions and recommendations. For more information on how to fully mainstream gender equality into evaluations, please refer to: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook</a>. The report could also be further improved by further anchoring the analysis within a human rights framework (e.g., CRC, CEDAW, etc.), and by making reference to specific articles stipulated therein. Finally, UNICEF standards require all evaluations to take an equity-sensitive approach and to identify vulnerable groups and their needs to the greatest extent possible. To learn more about how to conduct equity sensitive evaluations, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/node/4427">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/node/4427</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I</td>
<td>The executive summary could be improved by providing more explanatory information regarding the findings. Additionally, it is essential for conclusions and key recommendations to be included and clearly labelled within the Executive Summary in order to quickly inform decision-makers. To learn more about how to draft an effective Executive Summary, please see: <a href="https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guides/executive_summaries/unicef">https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guides/executive_summaries/unicef</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>