

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: November, 2020

EVALUACIÓN DE LA EDUCACIÓN INTERCULTURAL BILINGÜE EN LAS ESCUELAS INDÍGENAS DEL ZULIA Y AMAZONAS

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		64%	Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report		EVALUACIÓN DE LA EDUCACIÓN INTERCULTURAL BILINGÜE EN LAS ESCUELAS INDÍGENAS DEL ZULIA Y AMAZONAS	
Report sequence number		Venezuela/62/2020/13705	
Region		LACR	
Year of report		Presumably 2020 but there is no date in the report	
Office		Country office	
Coverage (countries)		Venezuela	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		August 11, 2021	
Name of review firm		DeftEdge	
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)		Country-led (government) evaluation	
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives		No	
Every child learns		Yes	
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation		No	
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment		No	
Every child has an equitable chance in life		No	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		No	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Evaluation object		Programme	
Evaluation type		Formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Theory-based	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		None mentioned	
EQA Summary:			
Es una evaluación diseñada mas como un estudio sobre la integración de bilingüismo en escuelas en comunidades indígenas, con buenos datos sobre porque existen los problemas pero no como se puede resolverlos. Explica bien porque la educación cultural no funciona bien en las comunidades estudiados, pero no indica bien como se puede resolver los problemas identificados. La metodología funciona bien y el analisis es de estandarres altas.			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
Debe tener un resumen ejecutivo y anexos. Debe tener algunas referencias a los derechos de niños.			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	0%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	No	No hay resumen ejecutivo
ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Not Rated	
iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Not Rated	
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	79%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	La intervención en terminos del sistema de educación es descrito pero no en terminos de costo y presupuesto.
ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	Los beneficiarios y los intervenores (como docentes y lideres locales) estan descrito en detalle.

Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	El contexto de la educación bilingüe y sus orígenes está bien descrito.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	No hay mención de los SDG.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Las condiciones de los estudiantes (y estudiantes potenciales) están descritas.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	Los implementadores (principalmente los docentes que administran o trabajan en las escuelas o los líderes locales) están descritos en detalle.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	UNICEF financia la evaluación.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	70%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	El objetivo, según los TdR, es "Realizar un análisis sistemático, mediante trabajo de campo y de escritorio, sobre el funcionamiento de la modalidad de EIB con la finalidad de conocer cómo sus procesos conducen al logro de resultados favorables en el aprendizaje y permanencia de las niñas, niños y adolescentes indígenas de tres entidades federales del país (Amazonas, Delta Amacuro y Zulia), así como detectar los problemas operativos a los que se enfrenta y las buenas prácticas que se realizan, de manera que se puedan generar recomendaciones que permitan mejorar su calidad."
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i 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 (if applicable).	Yes	Lo que debe lograr la evaluación es muy claro.
	ii 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, if applicable, 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	Lo que dice al principio, la evaluación es "En la presente evaluación se recaba información sobre la pertinencia, eficiencia y eficacia alcanzada hasta la fecha por la modalidad de EIB impartida en los niveles inicial, básica, media y diversificada del sistema educativo oficial en los estados Zulia y Amazonas."
Question 7.	Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Partially	El informe indica los intentos de la política en forma general, pero no es muy específico.
	ii Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	No	No hay una discusión.
	iii For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Not Rated	
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	70%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 8.	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	Aunque las cuestiones no son tradicionales, están bien elaboradas para los objetivos de la evaluación.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	No	No existe una matriz de evaluación,
Question 9.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods is relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	El diseño de la evaluación es completamente relevante.

	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	Las fuentes básicas incluyen docentes, administradores, académicos, estudiantes y miembros de la comunidad, que son los que tienen la información necesaria.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Los bases para la selección de lugares son bien descritos.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	Los aspectos cuantitativos están bien descritos, pero el análisis en base de entrevistas profundas no está bien descrito.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	La conexión entre la enseñanza y la reacción de los estudiantes es clara.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	La evaluación notó las limitaciones,
Question 10.		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:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).	No	No había referencia.
	ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Partially	Se mencionó que mantuvieron la identidad privada de los entrevistados pero también indicaron los nombres de algunos que fueron mencionados en el texto.
SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)			100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 11.		Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	Hay buena presentación de datos acerca de cada cuestión.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	No había una teoría de cambio.
Question 12.		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.		
	i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	Los datos son de entrevistas y examen de programas en las escuelas y son creíbles.
	ii	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 as relevant for each question.	Yes	Hay uso de indicadores y la evidencia es tanto positiva como negativa aunque la evaluación demuestra que el programa no es muy funcional.
	iii	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, 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	Para explicar porque los programas no están funcionando como esperado, hay un análisis muy completo de los factores causales.
Question 13.		Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i	Assessment of the adequacy 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 if required in ToR) to support decision-making.	Yes	La evaluación notó que no había un sistema de monitoreo.
SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)			83%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 14.		Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	Las conclusiones son completas y explican lo que la evaluación ha descubierto sobre el funcionamiento del programa.
	ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	Están totalmente basadas en los datos.
Question 15.		Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Partially	Algunas de las conclusiones tienen relevancia más general en cuanto a educación, pero no hay una sección sobre lecciones.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Not Rated	
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)			25%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 16.		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		

	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partially	Las recomendaciones son muy general, como dice una: "deben plantearse estrategias que permitan al Régimen de EIB enfrentar la desvalorización del mundo indígena y la consecuente idealización de la sociedad que lo envuelve".
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Algunas de las recomendaciones son accionable, como por ejemplo, Creación / fortalecimiento de equipos deportivos. Otros son muy generales y por lo tanto no accionable.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	No	El proceso no esta descrito.
Question 17.	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	No	Aunque en general, las recomendaciones deben ser implementado por los encargados del programa, este no esta descrito en forma preciso. En algunos casos, el responsable es muy general como, por ejemplo, "El ausentismo, la deserción, la debilitada infraestructura, el déficit nutricional y la escasez de materiales didácticos son dificultades comunes a toda la educación pública venezolana."
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 18.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	No	No sigue este patrón.
	ii Annexes include, if not in report body: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework, 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, results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	No	No hay anexos.
Question 19.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	La estructura va introducción, capítulos sobre encuentros, conclusiones y recomendaciones;
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Partially	La discusión de contexto y metodología va primero. No hay sección sobre lecciones aprendidas.
Question 20.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	Tiene 66 páginas.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	Está bien escrita.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	Hay 22 tablas.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	26%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 21.	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?		
	i 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.	No	No hablo del aspecto de derechos.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	No	No había estructura de referencia.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	La lenguaje es como debe ser.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Partially	Hay referencia a cuestiones de género y los derechos de educación, pero es en forma general.
Question 22.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)	1	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Not at all integrated	No hay referencia a genero.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Las entrevistas podrían distinguir entre mujeres y hombres, pero esto no es un factor básico en la metodología.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Not at all integrated	No hay referencia a genero en las conclusiones y recomendaciones..
SWAP Rating Guidance			

i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.

- a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?
- b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

- a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

- a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?
- b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?