



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				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of Social Work Coaching				
Report sequence number	2011/004	Date of Review	30/3/12	Year of the Evaluation Report	2011
Region	South Asia Regional Office		Country(ies)	Afghanistan	
Type of Report	Evaluation		TORs Present	No	
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & 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				
Management <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.5 Not clear from Report				
Purpose <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				
Result <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM; refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme				The report states that impact is being sought, and reports against this - but the results cited (and assessed) are output and outcome, not impact. Also the intervention is a discrete set of projects, rather than a coherent programme.
MTSP Correspondence <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 (4. Child Protection)				
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.				
Timing / Stage	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				Although the report asks questions about impact and effectiveness, project implementation is still

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Object and context			
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	The object is relatively well described, including its rationale, needs base and implementing modalities. Some aspects of the context are clearly set out, including the socioeconomic environment in Afghanistan plus the national frameworks relevant to the object. Surprisingly, the implications of the conflict environment in Afghanistan are only discussed at the end of the report, in a very limited way.	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Almost		
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Almost		
Theory of Change			
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Almost	The intended achievements and results chain for the overall set of projects is set out, though it is recognised that the results chains formulated by component projects did not always cohere to this and in fact applied results at different levels. More attention could be paid to discussing these shortcomings, which are significant.	Confident to Act
Stakeholders and their contributions			
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency (ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes		
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Yes		
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Almost		
Implementation Status			
8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Yes	The implementation state of the projects is described explicitly, and the methodological implications of the implementation status are also made clear.	The theory of change should always be explicitly described and its limitations for evaluability made clear in an opening section of the evaluation.
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The report provides a clear description of the evaluation object, including the rationale and some aspects - though not all - of the context. The intended achievements and results chain for the set of projects are made explicit, though the limitations of the results chain especially - particularly for evaluability - could be expanded upon in technical terms.		

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

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
Purpose, objectives and scope					
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Almost	The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are set out in a specific section for this purpose. Most of the required information is present: however, there could be more detail on who the users of the evaluation would be, and how the information would be used by stakeholders.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Almost				
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes				
Evaluation framework					
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include: Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Almost	The evaluation criteria set by the ToR, which are the 5 DAC criteria, are cited, and their relevance to the evaluation questions made clear. However, these are not justified or explained, nor their use critiqued given the clear limitations to the evaluability of sustainability and impact in particular set out in the previous section. The use of the criteria needs to be justified and their appropriateness for the study made clear.	Almost Confident to Act	The relevant section of the report does set out the evaluation purpose, scope and objectives, though there needs to be more detail on the users and use of the findings. Evaluation criteria are made clear, but these are not justified / their appropriateness for the study assessed, which is a significant omission given the difficulties for the study in robustly assessing sustainability and impact.	Evaluation criteria should always be justified, and their relevance to / utility for a study explained.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	No				
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The relevant section of the report does set out the evaluation purpose, scope and objectives, though there needs to be more detail on the users and use of the findings. Evaluation criteria are made clear, but these are not justified / their appropriateness for the study assessed, which is a significant omission given the difficulties for the study in robustly assessing sustainability and impact.				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection				
14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.	Almost	The report does go some way to setting out the methods used, but e.s. sampling (numbers of interviews? with whom? where?) and analysis are not discussed. The mix of data sources and the rationale for selection are partially explained, but need more detail e.g. how was a diversity of perspectives ensured.	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</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>	
15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	Almost			
Ethics				
16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	No	Surprisingly for a study that involves presumably some interviews with vulnerable children and parents (as implied but not made explicit in the methodology section) ethical standards / safeguards are not mentioned. If such interviews were indeed conducted, this should be addressed (it is a serious omission).		
17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors	No			
Results Based Management				
18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	Almost	The monitoring system is addressed to a limited extent, largely from the perspective of critiquing constraints. More detail could be given on how monitoring data was gathered across the different projects, its validity, and how it was applied within the evidence base.	<p>Almost Confident to Act</p> <p>The methodology is presented, but would need greater detail (sampling base, analytical methods and their rationale for selection, triangulation / verification processes etc) before it could be considered adequately robust to respond to evaluation questions. Gender, human rights and equity would benefit from more systematic mainstreaming, and limitations need more explicit discussion, particularly around e.g. the tools used, to give full confidence in the methodology.</p>	
19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? 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.	Almost			
Human Rights, Gender and Equity				
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? 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	Almost	The evaluation does include human rights, gender and equity considerations, but beyond a separate section at the end of the report, the report does not contain a very systematic coverage of these issues. Beyond gender disaggregation, for example, gender could be more systematically mainstreamed to consider whether the individual projects addressed gender issues, how they did so, and with what results. Similarly the language and	<p>All evaluations which involve the interviewing of vulnerable beneficiaries such as children should explain the ethical standards used and how these were applied.</p>	
Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>				

<p>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks? 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>	No	<p>approach could be more rights-oriented. Exclusion and equity issues are similarly tangentially addressed.</p>			
<p>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)? The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.</p>	Almost				
<p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	Almost				
<p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY? The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.</p>	Almost				
Stakeholder participation					
<p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	Almost	<p>There is some reference to stakeholder consultation throughout the methodology section e.g. a validation session at draft findings / conclusion stage, but the rationale for the level of consultation is not made clear. This leaves open the possibility that greater participation could have achieved, which would have been desirable.</p>			

<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p>	Almost				
Methodological robustness					
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? 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	<p>The constructing of a counterfactual would have been difficult for this object in this environment. The methodology clearly has the potential - given the constraints of the environment - to answer the questions in hand, but needs more detail (sampling base, analytical methods, triangulation / verification processes etc) before it would be considered adequately robust to answer the evaluation questions. The limitations are openly described, but tools are not attached, and risk of bias, plus how this was avoided, not explained.</p>			
<p>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Almost				
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Almost				
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The methodology is presented, but would need greater detail (sampling base, analytical methods and their rationale for selection, triangulation / verification processes etc) before it could be considered adequately robust to respond to evaluation questions. Gender, human rights and equity would benefit from more systematic mainstreaming, and limitations need more explicit discussion, particularly around e.g. the tools used, to give full confidence in the methodology.</p>				

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Almost	The findings are clearly presented and oriented against the different evaluation criteria, but the evidence for each finding is not always clearly marshalled, so the evidence base at times appears weak. The progression through results levels is not always clear, with one aspect of impact e.g. being interpreted as capacity development (which is at a different level from impact on children's lives). Effectiveness and impact are sometimes confused. There needs to be more discussion of gaps and limitations in the evidence.	Almost Confident to Act	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes			
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Almost			
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	N/A			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: 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.	Almost	There is some limited cost analysis of some aspects of the programme, but this is not detailed and no comparator costs are clearly cited (though general statements of costs being within a reasonable range are made). There is no discussion of implications of scaling up / down / transferring context.		When conducting cost analysis, judgements on efficiency against comparator costs should be clearly evidenced.
Contribution and causality				
36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.	Almost	The evaluation does make some effort to assign contribution for results to some stakeholders, but this could and should be more systematic and explicit. A variety of stakeholders were consulted in reaching conclusions. Causal reasons for success /failure are explored to a limited extent, but could be much more deeply examined, particularly in the light of the complex context of Afghanistan.		
37 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.	Yes			

<p>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Almost			
Strengths, weaknesses and implications				
<p>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>The section on sustainability does consider the implications of continuing constraints in terms of effectiveness and the ability to deliver results. The conclusions are balanced in tone and do reflect the strengths and weaknesses found.</p>		
<p>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes			
Completeness and insight of conclusions				
<p>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Almost	<p>The conclusions mainly summarise the findings, with some limited additional insights in the impact and sustainability sections. They are at an appropriate level for the intended users of the evaluation.</p>		
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Yes			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The findings do respond to the evaluation criteria set out, and follow the methodology described, though at times the data does not appear fully marshalled, so that the evidence base appears weak. Conclusions are balanced and do provide reasonable judgements based on the evidence, but would benefit from greater depth of insight overall rather than merely summarising findings.</p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations				
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are grounded in the evidence generally, and are relevant. However, they are very numerous, and while split into short and intermediate / long term, beyond this division they are presented as a long list without prioritisation.	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	No			
Usefulness of recommendations				
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Almost	Some of the recommendations indicate the target group for action but many do not. Similarly, while some are realistic, others are vague or over-ambitious. The process of arriving at the recommendations is not discussed.	Almost Confident to Act	ToRs should set a maximum number of recommendations and / or state that these must be prioritised.
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Almost			
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No			
Appropriate lessons learned				
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Almost	Lessons learned are implicit within the conclusions / lessons learned chapter: they are not separately identified and they are not generalised - through several are generalisable - to indicate wider relevance.		
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	No			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The recommendations are relevant and grounded in the evidence: however they are presented as a long list which is unprioritised and at times unrealistic. Lessons learned are not explicitly identified, and no generalisable learning is drawn out (though some is present implicitly).			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation			<p>F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms</p>	Yes	<p>All the required basic elements are present and the report is well structured. Annexes are listed, and contain most but not all of the suggested components (e.g. no evaluation matrix is included) but these are not annexed, so no judgement can be made about increasing utility / credibility.</p>		
<p>52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt</p>	Yes			
<p>53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report</p>	Almost			
<p>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</p>	N/A			
Executive Summary				
<p>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A</p>	Yes	<p>The report is well structured and presented clearly, being generally well written. However, the Executive Summary risks presenting information selectively, rather than standing as a true summary of the findings / conclusions / recommendations.</p>	<p>Almost Confident to Act</p>	<p>Executive Summaries should provide a compressed version of the main findings / conclusions / recommendations of a report, and ensure that it is comprehensive rather than selective.</p>
<p>56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations</p>	Almost			
<p>57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments</p>	Almost			
<p>58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.</p>	Almost			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>				
Additional Information				
Question	Remarks			
<p>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	<p>NO TERMS OF REFERENCE WERE ATTACHED TO THE REPORT. ALL FUTURE EVALUATIONS SHOULD HAVE THE ORIGINAL TOR INCLUDED AS AN ANNEX.</p>			
<p>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation</p>	<p>The evaluation does provide a relatively good description of the object.</p>			

iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise

The evaluators clearly do have good knowledge of social work issues around vulnerable children generally.

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Almost	Each individual section does have strengths, but the report would need a more comprehensive description of the methodology, better marshalling of evidence and stronger conclusions / recommendations before confidence could be held in the sections independently.	Almost Confident to Act The report goes some way to presenting credible findings, but would need a stronger and more comprehensively described methodology, better marshalling of evidence, and stronger conclusions / recommendations before it could be used with confidence. The difficult setting of Afghanistan for conducting research is a major mitigating factor; but even despite this, a clear chain of evidence from which conclusions and recommendations are logically derived, is lacking.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	The report is logically structured and does hold together well.	
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	To Rs	N/A	
	Other	The conflict setting of Afghanistan, and the difficulties of conducting research there, are mitigating factors, though these should be more clearly described.	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	With a little more work this report could be used in confidence. The report goes some way to presenting credible findings, but would need a stronger and more comprehensively described methodology, better marshalling of evidence, and stronger conclusions / recommendations before it could be used with confidence. The difficult setting of Afghanistan for conducting research is a major mitigating factor; but even despite this, a clear chain of evidence from which conclusions and recommendations are logically derived, is lacking.		