Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation
EVALUATION OF THE SWAZILAND CHILD FRIENDLY SCHOOLS (CFS) PROGRAMME

Sequence No 2017/001
Region ESAR
Office Swaziland
Coverage Swaziland

Evaluation Type Programme
Year of Report 2017

OVERALL RATING

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

Lessons for future evaluations:
It would be useful for the Evaluation Manager to emphasize the importance of explicitly discussing the UNICEF standards for Ethical Research Involving Children as well as the obligations of evaluators within the evaluation report. Also, the Conclusions should provide a more insightful analysis of the evidence presented in the findings.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory
The report does a very good job at describing the initiative, and includes all relevant information such as location, timeline, and the beneficiaries by type. Similarly, the socioeconomic and political context in which the programme operated is described in great detail as well as the relative importance of the programme to UNICEF. Key stakeholders and their contributions are equally discussed, including those of UNICEF. The intended results of the intervention are clearly stated as well. While the evaluation explains that the programme's logic framework was not made available by the commissioning agency, the evaluating team does present a reconstruction of the logical framework that includes a graphic chart of outputs leading to outcomes and impact.

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

Highly Satisfactory
The report clearly discusses the way in which the evaluation is intended to be used and the intended users of it are well identified (i.e. the Ministry of Education and Training and its partners who are implementing Inqaba at school level, community level, nationally, and regionally). Also, the objectives that the evaluation is seeking to achieve are discussed in detail. Finally, the scope of the evaluation in terms of its geographic and chronological coverage is duly explained.
**SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)**

**Satisfactory**

The report explains in detail the evaluation methodology (which is robust) and describes methods and data collection tools. Also, the report does a good job at describing data sources, data sampling strategies as well as the triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data. Similarly, methodological limitations along with mitigation strategies are provided. On the other hand, while ethical safeguards observed during the conduct of this evaluation are discussed, nothing is said regarding the Ethical Guidelines for Research Involving Children or the obligations of the evaluators.

---

**SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)**

**Highly Satisfactory**

The report presents robust and multi-tiered evidence in order to support the evaluation findings. The findings are clearly presented according to the intervention's logical framework, address the main pillars of the programme, are presented under each evaluation criterion, and respond to key evaluation questions. The findings are based on the objective use of the evidence and make reference to both positive and negative results, including the occurrence of unintended findings and an analysis of these, as requested in the ToRs. The evaluation is also strong at explaining the causal factors for the achievement and non-achievement of results. Finally, the intervention's M&E system is assessed (which is described as weak) and the report provides recommendations on how to improve the M&E system for better future programming.

---

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

**Fair**

The report presents conclusions that are generally derived from the findings but they are general and lack analytical insight. While they discuss both strengths and weaknesses of the initiative, they are very short and lack adequate analysis. On the other hand, the lessons learned are pitched at the right level and are correctly generalized so as to indicate what wider relevance they may have in different projects and contexts.

---

**SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)**

**Highly Satisfactory**

Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be useful to end users as they are actionable and are divided into manageable sub-groups. They also clearly identify the target group for action in each case. The report explains the process through which recommendations were formulated and the level of participation of stakeholders in this process is also discussed.

---

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

The report is well structured in a traditional evaluation format. The report annexes are complete and add significant credibility to the report. They include the ToRs, an evaluation matrix, list of people interviewed, list of data sources, copies of the evaluation tools, and information about the evaluators. While the opening pages contain some of the required elements, the name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation, the timeframe of the initiative, and the names of the evaluators are not indicated.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The evaluation uses a rights-based approach and consistently makes reference to CRC and Human Rights. The report also assesses the extent to which Human Rights, CRC and the notions of equity and gender were incorporated in the initial design and implementation of the programme. The evaluation also describes the level of stakeholders' involvement in the programme implementation as well as in the evaluation process which seems to proportionally correspond in both cases. Concerning the UN-SWAP indicators: 1) GEEW is fully integrated into the indicators in the Evaluation Matrix; 2) the evaluation criteria and questions adequately address the extent to which GEEW was integrated in the initial design and implementation of the intervention; 3) methodological tools and techniques are sufficient to ensure that gender-sensitive data was collected, but do not include participatory sensemaking; and 4) the findings, and recommendations include a gender analysis.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The Executive Summary is a bit long (11 pages) and could be further synthesized. It provides a thorough overview of the evaluation and highlights the most important elements of the report. It includes all of the required information to understand the evaluation without needing to reference the body of the report. However, the Executive Summary does not include a summary of the evaluation conclusions.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meets requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>This section observes good practice. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>This section observes good practice. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>It is important that the report discuss in detail the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children in order to explicitly acknowledge that the minors' rights were respected, as per UNICEF standards. Also, the obligations of the evaluators during the conduct of the evaluation should be explicitly discussed in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E</strong></td>
<td>The conclusions should constitute an added value to the information presented in the findings. It is good practice that the conclusions provide further analysis of the evidence and that this analysis help foresee probable implications that may arise in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section F</strong></td>
<td>The recommendations observe good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section G</strong></td>
<td>It is good practice for the opening pages to indicate the name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation, the timeframe of the initiative, and the names of the evaluators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section H</strong></td>
<td>This section observes good practices for the most part. The Conclusions in general should be more insightful and should include a more explicit gender analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I</strong></td>
<td>The Executive Summary could be strengthened by being further synthesized and shortened. It should also include a summary of the evaluation conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>