

4+1 Rating	Visualisation	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●
	Section & Overall Rating	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated		
	Weighting (Score)	4	3	2	1	0	0		
Implication	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.	Does not sufficiently meet the UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports; and thus decision makers cannot rely on the evaluation.	Important aspects of the evaluation that are required by the UNICEF/UNEG standards were found to be absent and so the evaluation report is incomplete.	An aspect of the evaluation was not rated for a legitimate reason that does not undermine the quality of evaluation report.			

NOTE to Reviewers: complete the cells formatted in Yellow

<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	Independent Evaluation of the Health Transition Fund in Zimbabwe										
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2016/001										
<b>Region</b>	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office		Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office	Middle East and North Africa Regional Office	South Asia Regional Office	West and Central Africa Regional Office	Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office	HQ Unit	Evaluation Office (Corporate)
<b>Year of Report Completion</b>	2016										
<b>Country</b>	Zimbabwe										
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		Yes	No							
<b>Date of Review</b>	9/22/2016										
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	ImpactReady (incl. Merits)		ImpactReady (incl. Merits)	Independent							
<b>Classification of Evaluation Report</b>											
<b>Management of Evaluation</b> (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)	Jointly Managed with Country		UNICEF managed	Joint managed with Country/IN	Joint managed with Country/Outside	Jointly Managed with Country	Country-led (Government/Evaluation)	Externally managed	Not clear from Report		
<b>SPOA Correspondence</b> (Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)	<b>Health</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>WASH</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Nutrition</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Education</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Child protection</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Social inclusion</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Gender equality (cross-cutting)</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
	<b>Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)</b>	Yes	Yes	No							
<b>Evaluation object</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	Pilot/innovation	Project	Programme	Country Programme	Joint Programme	Organization/business unit	Policy/Norms/Standards	Thematic area	Strategy	System
<b>Evaluation type</b>	<b>Summative</b>	Formative	Summative	Summative and formative	Meta Evaluation						
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	<b>Mixed methods</b>	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed methods							
<b>Evaluation design</b>	<b>Retrospective</b>	Experimental	Quasi-experimental	Case study	Comparative	Participatory	Action-research	Systematic review	Cross-sectional	Longitudinal	Cohort/D
<b>Evaluation level</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	Output	Outcome	Impact							Retrospec Theory-b
<b>Geographic Scope</b>	<b>National</b>	National	Multi-country	Regional	Multi-region/Global	Other					
<b>SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		<b>Rating</b>	If not rated, provide reasons here								
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</b>	100%									
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1
	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e. institutions/organisations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e. urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1
<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</b>	100%									
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated				1

Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	100%						
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	100%						
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary-duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b>		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best		Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
The report provides a precise and extremely clear picture of the evaluation object. This may well reflect the long term involvement of the evaluators in having supported various processes during implementation.		4	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention, its context and its intended results	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
<b>Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting						
		0.05						

<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	83%						
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%						
	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the TORs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b>		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
The report draws on the purpose and objectives of the ToR, and elaborates these. Whilst all of the required information is present, there is some slight confusion between purpose and objectives in the way that they are presented. This is relevant since the evaluation took place 6 months after the close of the ITF, so it is important to clearly state what changes the process was expected to contribute to (accountability is clear, but in what way were the lessons-learnt specified as an objective expected to be used?).		3	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the evaluation's purpose, intended use, and scope (for instance, listing the evaluation questions)	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
<b>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting						
The 'purpose' of the evaluation should clearly state the accountability relationships or future changes that the evaluation is expected to contribute to, whilst the 'objectives' focus on the		0.05						

<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? (UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.)	100%						
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described	Not Rated		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	100%						
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	100%						

1  
1  
1  
1  
0.6666  
1  
1

Section	Weighting (%)
Background	5
Purpose	5
Methods	15
Findings	20
Conclusions / Lessons	15
Recommendations	15
Structure	5
Executive Summary	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b>		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best		Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
<b>The methods section and additional annex are detailed, precise and relevant. The report is particularly notable with regard to the clear position on ethics both in terms of protection of participants and the independence/conduct of the evaluation team.</b>		4	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner. Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the evaluation framework, the evaluation methodology and ethical considerations, and how this is suitable for assessing the intervention	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
<b>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting 0.15						

<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope? Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	100%						
	If feasible and relevant to the purpose, cost analysis is clearly presented (how costs compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected results)-if not feasible, an explanation is provided	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	100%						
	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	The causal factors (contextual, organisational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	100%						
	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b>		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best		Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
<b>The findings section is extremely strong. Each question is addressed in a clear and concise way that marshals multiple sources of evidence, presents the interpretation of this evidence, and explains its implications.</b>		4	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner. Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the implementation and results of the intervention, data and/or implementation gaps, of the way in which the analysis of the data leads to the findings, and/or of the effects of the contributions of key stakeholders	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
<b>Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting 0.2						

<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	100%						
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	0%						

	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	No	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
--	--	----	-----	--------	--------	----	-----------

<b>••••</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b>	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric				
-------------	--	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--

	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
--	---	------	---------------------	--------------	------	----------------	---------	-----------

	<b>The conclusions are robust and logically derived from the findings, adding value to the overall analysis. However, the report does not clearly elaborate and present lessons learnt that are applicable to the wider context, either within or outside of Zimbabwe. Whilst lessons may be implicitly derived from the findings about what has worked in this specific case, the objectives of the evaluation specify the identification of lessons and therefore it is necessary to also examine the external validity of the report's findings.</b>		Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the implementation and results of the intervention, data and/or implementation gaps, of the way in which the analysis of the data leads to the findings, and/or of the effects of the contributions of key stakeholders	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
--	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	--

<b>Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting					
The terms of reference call for the identification of lessons learned (defined as contributions to wider knowledge by UNEG). It would have been helpful to have highlighted these within		0.15					

<b>SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here				
--	--	--------	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	67%					
--------------	--	-----	--	--	--	--	--

	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	17%					
--------------	--	-----	--	--	--	--	--

	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	No	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear prioritisation and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>••••</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b>	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric				
-------------	--	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--

	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
--	---	------	---------------------	--------------	------	----------------	---------	-----------

	<b>The recommendations section is clearly challenged by the absence of a clear formative purpose for the evaluation, leading to recommendations that - whilst being clear, relevant and logical - are general and not aimed at specific groups. These may contribute to the general body of knowledge within the health sector, but it is unclear regarding who should be accountable for delivering the recommendations.</b>		Includes all the elements described for all the questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of how the recommendations are logically derived from the findings, and/or of the relevance and feasibility of the recommendations and/or of the criteria for prioritisation and/or of the reasons for targeting each recommendation to a particular group of action	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
--	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	--

<b>Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting					
Recommendations would benefit from targeting specific evaluation users - at the moment they seem most applicable to an unspecified future programme designer, but it is not clear		0.15					

<b>SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here				
---	--	--------	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	100%					
--------------	--	------	--	--	--	--	--

	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organisation(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organisation commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	100%					
--------------	-------------------------------------	------	--	--	--	--	--

	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

<b>••••</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section G</b>	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric				
-------------	--	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--

0

1

0.6666

0.3333

0

0.3333

1

1

1

1

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
<b>This is an extremely well written, clear and logical report.</b>	4	Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner  The information is presented in an innovative manner that enhances the navigability of the report, and/or the report provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention and the evaluation	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)

<b>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting 0.05
--	-------------------

<b>SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)</b>	Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here
--	--------	------------------------------------

Question 19.	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?	56%						
	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	0.3333
	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	0.6666
	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	0.6666
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	75%						
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	1
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	0.6666
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalised groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	1
	Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the TORs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	0.3333

Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Meets requirements						
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	8						
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	Fully integrated 3 points	Fully integrated 3 points	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Partially integrated 1 point	Not at all integrated 0 points		3
	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Fully integrated 3 points	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Partially integrated 1 point	Not at all integrated 0 points		2
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Fully integrated 3 points	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Partially integrated 1 point	Not at all integrated 0 points		2
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	Partially integrated 1 point	Fully integrated 3 points	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points	Partially integrated 1 point	Not at all integrated 0 points		1

<b>Executive Feedback on Section H</b>	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
--	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	--	--	--

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
<b>The approach taken to analysis of equity in the findings of this evaluation is outstanding, and a example for other evaluation reports. The impacts of interventions on different groups within the findings section is systematic and central to the evaluative analysis. Whilst there is a commitment to gender analysis (and this is accommodated within the findings under the assessment of equity), only one paragraph under the relevance conclusions and none of the recommendations reflect this commitment.</b>	3	Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner  Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention's M&E system and its usability in the evaluation, and/or of how the evaluation incorporates a human rights based framework, a gender equity perspective, and/or equity considerations, and/or of how the intervention incorporates human rights frameworks and/or of how the evaluation and/or the intervention incorporates participatory elements	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)

<b>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</b>	Weighting 0.15
There is scope for the excellent analysis of equity to have been carried through to the conclusions and recommendations, and a specific requirement from UN SWAP for gender	

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here				
Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	100%					
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
<b>Executive Feedback on Section I</b>		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric				
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best		Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
As with the rest of the report, the executive summary is clear, concise and systematically presents relevant information in easy-to-understand language.		4	Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the evaluation and its findings and recommendations	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
<b>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</b>		Weighting					
		0.05					
		Weighting checksum (should equal 1)					
<b>OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)</b>		3.2	Satisfactory				

1  
1  
1