

EVALUATION ID	3380-2015/001
---------------	---------------

**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

<a href="#">UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</a>
--	--	---

Response					
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Rapport de l'Évaluation externe de la Stratégie Sectorielle de l'Éducation 2015-2025 de la République du Congo</b>				
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2015/001	<b>Date of Review</b>	16/10/2015	<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2015
<b>Region</b>	West and Central Africa Regional Office			<b>Country</b>	Congo
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation			<b>TORs Present</b>	No
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	<b>Universalia Management Group</b>				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments
<b>Geographic Scope</b> ( <i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings</i> )	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.				
<b>Management of Evaluation</b> ( <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.				
<b>Purpose</b> ( <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				
<b>Result</b> ( <i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i> )	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control				Cette évaluation est une analyse de la version révisée du document de la Stratégie Sectorielle de l'Éducation (SSE) en date du 17 décembre 2014.
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> ( <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> )	5.5 Education: Supporting global efforts to provide access to quality education for both boys and girls through improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education. Programme areas: a) Early learning b) Equity with a focus on girls' education and inclusive education c) Learning and child friendly schools d) Education in humanitarian situations				
<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>Approach</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.	Outstanding	Le rapport fournit une description très claire et détaillée de l'évolution de la SSE aboutissant à la version actuelle, objet de l'évaluation (pp. 9, 13-18). Il ne s'agit pas d'une évaluation typique car l'objet évalué est une stratégie sectorielle en voie de finalisation qui n'a donc pas encore été mise en œuvre. Par conséquent, les dimensions coûts et nombre de bénéficiaires sont sans objet dans le cadre de cette évaluation. Le contexte, qui comprend des facteurs démographiques, économiques, sectoriels et politiques, est très bien expliqué (pp. 10-13). Le contexte décrit est en rapport avec les constats.	<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	Outstanding			
<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.	Yes			
<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.	Yes	Bien qu'il ne s'agisse pas d'une théorie du changement proprement dite, la logique des composantes de la SSE est décrite ainsi que les objectifs, activités et résultats attendus en lien avec certaines des composantes (pp. 18-29). Cette section du rapport constitue une analyse critique des mesures annoncées dans la SSE.	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	
<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	Yes	Les parties prenantes de la SSE, y compris UNICEF, sont clairement identifiées ainsi que leurs contributions à l'élaboration et à la diffusion du document (pp. 13-14).		
<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	Yes			
<b>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
<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	Outstanding	Tel que mentionné en réponse à la Q1 ci-dessus, le rapport décrit très bien l'évolution de la SSE, y compris les changements importants dont le document a fait l'objet en cours d'élaboration.		
<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>Le rapport présente une description détaillée, claire et complète de l'objet de l'évaluation, soit la dernière version révisée de la SSE du Congo. Il décrit bien le contexte, les différentes étapes dans l'élaboration du document ainsi que les contributions des parties prenantes, dont UNICEF.</b>			

**Constructive feedback for future reports**  
*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*

La description claire et détaillée de l'objet de l'évaluation est représentative des bonnes pratiques en matière de rapportage.

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.	Yes	L'objectif général et les objectifs spécifiques de l'évaluation sont clairs et réalistes (p. 9). La portée est relativement claire mais aurait été bonifiée par l'inclusion des questions d'évaluation. Les objectifs spécifiques et la portée sont en adéquation avec l'objectif général identifié.	<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>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	Mostly				
<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)	Yes				
<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; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Mostly	Bien que le rapport ne le mentionne pas de manière explicite, les critères standards de l'OCDE-CAD ne s'appliquent pas dans le cas présent car, tel que mentionné ci-dessus, cette évaluation n'est pas une évaluation typique de programme. Le rapport indique que l'évaluation s'est structurée autour des critères d'admissibilité au Partenariat Mondial pour l'Éducation (PME) « en utilisant sur le plan méthodologique le guide pour la préparation et l'évaluation d'un plan sectoriel de l'éducation, réalisé par le PME (version de novembre 2012).» (p. 9) Le rapport n'inclut pas une matrice d'évaluation en annexe.	<b>Mostly Satisfactory</b>	L'objectif général, les objectifs spécifiques et la portée de l'évaluation sont suffisamment clairs pour guider l'évaluation mais des éléments importants telles les questions d'évaluation et la matrice d'évaluation ne sont pas incluses dans le rapport.	Il est de bonne pratique en évaluation d'intégrer les questions d'évaluation dans le narratif du rapport ou en annexe et d'inclure une matrice d'évaluation comprenant les questions d'évaluation, indicateurs, sources et méthodes de collecte de données.
<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 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.	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>L'objectif général, les objectifs spécifiques et la portée de l'évaluation sont suffisamment clairs pour guider l'évaluation. Toutefois, les questions d'évaluation ne sont pas incluses et il n'y a pas de matrice d'évaluation proprement dite.</b>				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Data collection</b>			
<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	Le rapport principal n'inclut pas une section décrivant la méthodologie d'évaluation. La méthodologie est seulement décrite dans le résumé administratif. Toutefois, des sources de données sont identifiées dans le texte (p. 15), dans les notes en bas de page et les Annexes 1 et 7.	<p><b>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</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>	Mostly		
<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	Des considérations d'ordre éthique ne sont pas mentionnées dans le rapport.	
<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>	N/A		
<b>Results Based Management</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>	Yes	Des données provenant du système de suivi-évaluation du secteur éducatif sont prises en compte dans l'évaluation de la SSE et le rapport fait souvent référence aux résultats attendus de la réforme éducative assortis d'indicateurs, mentionnant également des lacunes dans le système d'information pour la gestion de l'éducation (SIGE) (pp. 15-23, 26-27, 30, 33-34, 37-39, 43-44, 46, 51). Une section du rapport est dédiée à l'examen de la fiabilité des mécanismes prévus pour le suivi et l'évaluation de la SSE (pp. 43-44).	<p>En l'absence d'une description détaillée de la méthodologie suivie dans le cadre de cette évaluation, il est difficile de juger de sa pertinence. Toutefois, les constats démontrent une bonne analyse de la SSE et fait référence à des sources de données variées. Le système de suivi-évaluation du secteur éducatif a été pris en compte ainsi que des questions liées au genre et à l'équité.</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>	Yes		
			<p>Tout rapport d'évaluation devrait présenter de manière complète et détaillée la méthodologie suivie dans le cadre de l'évaluation.</p>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**  
*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*

Human Rights, Gender and Equity	
<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></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><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></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><b>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)?</b></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 &amp; 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>	Mostly
<p><b>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</b></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 &amp; structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	Mostly
<p><b>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</b></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 &amp; aspects of equity.</p>	Mostly

Mostly Satisfactory

L'approche évaluative intègre des considérations liées aux droits humains, notamment le droit à une éducation de qualité, à l'égalité entre les sexes et à l'équité. Le rapport n'examine pas de manière explicite la SSE sous l'angle des droits humains mais, tel que mentionné, le droit à l'éducation est au cœur de celle-ci. Le cadre analytique et les constats fournissent des informations pertinentes sur les questions transversales, dont l'égalité entre les sexes et l'équité (pp. 26-29). Les aspects suivants sont mentionnés: le manque de données désagrégées selon le genre, la problématique de déperdition accentuée des filles et autres jeunes vulnérables « au fur et à mesure de leur progression dans le système éducatif. » (pp. 17, 22, 24-29). La question de l'autonomisation des femmes est implicite dans le maintien des filles à l'école et dans la priorisation de l'alphabétisation et l'éducation non formelle ciblant en particulier les femmes et autres groupes vulnérables (p. 25). Cependant, la méthodologie d'évaluation n'est pas présentée dans le rapport et les conclusions/ recommandations ne font pas mention du genre et de l'équité.

Stakeholder participation		
<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>	Mostly	Le rapport ne décrit pas le niveau de participation des parties prenantes au delà de leur participation à des entretiens (p. 14). Comme la méthodologie n'est pas décrite, il est difficile d'établir si le niveau de participation était adéquat.
<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>	Mostly	
Methodological robustness		
<p><b>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution?</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>	N/A	Tel que mentionné, le rapport principal ne présente pas la méthodologie suivie pour cette évaluation. Cependant, l'utilisation de groupes de contrôle ne semble pas applicable ici puisqu'il s'agit de l'évaluation d'une stratégie nationale.
<p><b>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to 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>	No	
<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>	No	
<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>En l'absence d'une description détaillée de la méthodologie suivie dans le cadre de cette évaluation, il est difficile de juger de sa pertinence. Par contre, l'analyse de la SSE est étoffée et le rapport présente de nombreuses sources d'information. Le rapport examine le système de suivi-évaluation du secteur en profondeur et les questions liées au genre et à l'équité sont prises en compte.</b></p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>			
<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.	Yes	Les constats sont présentés de manière claire et démontrent l'utilisation objective des données rapportées. Comme les questions d'évaluation ne sont pas identifiées dans le rapport, il n'est pas possible de fournir une réponse définitive à la Q31. Il y a une progression narrative logique dans les constats. Les limites des données disponibles sont identifiées et le rapport fournit des indications quant à leur interprétation (ex. pp. 17, 19, 23, 26, 41). Le rapport présente également des résultats inattendus (ex. pp. 13, 22-23, 31).	<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.
<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.	Mostly		
<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.	Yes		
<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.	Yes		
<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.	Yes		
<b>Cost Analysis</b>			
<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards</li> <li>o Most efficient way to get expected results</li> <li>o Cost implications of scaling up or down</li> <li>o Cost implications for replicating in a different context</li> <li>o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective</li> <li>o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.</li> </ul>	Yes	Les constats sont clairs et pertinents. Les conclusions identifiées ne résumant pas les constats mais sont plutôt des recommandations.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>

Contribution and causality		
<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>	Yes	<p>La contribution des diverses parties prenantes à l'élaboration de la SSE est décrite (pp. 13-14). La Q37 peut être considérée sans objet dans le contexte de cette évaluation puisqu'il s'agit d'une évaluation d'une stratégie sectorielle en voie de finalisation qui n'a donc pas encore été mise en œuvre.</p>
<p><b>37 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>	N/A	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p><b>38 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>	Yes	<p>Les implications futures des contraintes, si elles ne sont pas surmontées, sont décrites (ex. pp. 20, 23, 30, 33, 39, 42, 44-48). Une section du rapport est dédiée à l'analyse des risques et points de vigilance (pp. 44-48).</p>
<p><b>39 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>	Yes	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p><b>40 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>	No	<p>Les quelques conclusions présentées dans le rapport sont en fait des recommandations pour la suite de la SSE (pp. 50-51).</p>
<p><b>41 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>	No	
<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>	No	
<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>Les constats démontrent une utilisation objective des données de l'évaluation et la présentation des constats suit une progression logique. Toutefois, les conclusions identifiées ne résument pas les constats mais sont en réalité des recommandations.</b></p>	

Mostly Satisfactory



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.	Yes	Les recommandations découlent des constats (pp. 50-51). Elles sont pertinentes à l'objet et aux objectifs de l'évaluation. Elles sont peu nombreuses donc elles peuvent être considérées prioritaires.	<b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> 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.	<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	Yes			
<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.	Yes			
<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.	Yes	Les recommandations sont destinées aux partenaires techniques et financiers. Elles sont réalistes dans le contexte de l'évaluation. Le rapport ne décrit pas le processus d'élaboration des recommandations.	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	Les recommandations ne sont pas des conclusions proprement dites. Il est donc suggéré de les présenter sous un titre plus représentatif.
<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	Yes			
<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.	Mostly	Il n'y a pas de section dédiée aux leçons tirées mais le rapport incorpore dans les constats des leçons tirées des versions précédentes de la SSE (p. 14). Les leçons ne dépassent pas le cadre de la SSE.		
<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>Les recommandations découlent des constats et sont pertinentes à l'objet et aux objectifs de l'évaluation. Elles sont réalistes et bien ciblées. Le rapport n'inclut pas une section dédiée aux leçons tirées mais des enseignements découlant des versions précédentes de la SSE sont présentés à même les constats.</b>			

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>
<b>Style and presentation</b>				
<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	Mostly	Les premières pages du rapport contiennent presque tous les éléments de base exceptés le nom de l'organisation ayant mandaté l'évaluation, en l'occurrence UNICEF, ainsi que la liste des tableaux et graphiques. Le rapport est généralement bien structuré mais	Mostly Satisfactory	Tous les éléments nécessaires à la bonne compréhension de l'évaluation devraient être inclus dans le rapport. Ceci inclut des informations sur la méthodologie et les termes de référence.
<b>52 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Mostly	il manque quelques éléments importants telle la méthodologie. Les annexes contiennent des éléments pertinents mais insuffisants. Les éléments suivants sont absents: les TdR de l'évaluation, la matrice d'évaluation et les guides d'entrevue.		
<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	Mostly			
<b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Mostly			
<b>Executive Summary</b>				
<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	Le résumé administratif comprend presque tous les éléments nécessaires à une bonne compréhension des résultats de l'évaluation (pp. 6-9). Il manque toutefois une section décrivant les objectifs de l'évaluation. Cela dit, le résumé est concis et met en exergue les principaux constats. Il peut alimenter le processus de prise de décisions.		
<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	Mostly			
<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	Mostly			
<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.	Yes			
<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>Dans l'ensemble, ce rapport d'évaluation est bien structuré et bien écrit mais en raison de l'absence de la méthodologie d'évaluation, le flux logique du narratif est interrompu. Il y a aussi certains éléments manquants dans les premières pages et les annexes du rapport.</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	Le rapport n'inclut pas les TdR de l'évaluation. Tout rapport d'évaluation devrait inclure les TdR en annexe.			
<b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation	Le rapport reflète des bonnes pratiques évaluatives telles : la présentation objective des forces et faiblesses de la SSE et des principaux enjeux concernant son avenir.			

<b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Le rapport identifie quelques bonnes pratiques énoncées dans la SSE pour l'amélioration de la qualité de l'éducation de base, notamment «l'amélioration du taux d'encadrement, la résorption des effectifs pléthoriques, l'acquisition de manuels scolaires, la formation des enseignants et le renforcement de la supervision... priorité donnée aux petites classes, la mise en place d'un «plan lecture» et la création de coins lecture dans les écoles primaires et le repérage local des établissements les plus faibles. » (p. 20)		
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			
<b>Question</b>	<b>cc</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>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?</b> 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?	Mostly	Tenant compte de quelques sections manquantes, le rapport ne fournit qu'une crédibilité partielle permettant d'agir avec confiance.	<b>Mostly Satisfactory</b>
<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'.	Mostly	Le rapport dans l'ensemble est bien structuré et bien écrit mais il y a quelques chaînons manquants tel que mentionné.	
<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		
Other			
<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>Ce rapport présente une analyse et des constats pertinents au but et à l'objet de l'évaluation. Dans l'ensemble, il est bien structuré et bien écrit mais il manque quelques éléments importants telles les questions et la matrice d'évaluation et une description de la méthodologie suivie, ce qui limite sa crédibilité. Par conséquent, le rapport doit être utilisé avec une certaine prudence.</b>		