

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Evaluation of UNICEF's Protective Environment programme in Tajikistan (2016-2022)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	91%	Highly Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●-	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●--	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●---	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Evaluation of UNICEF's Protective Environment programme in Tajikistan (2016-2022)		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Tajikistan-66-2022-16485		
<b>Region</b>	ECAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2022		
<b>Office</b>	Tajikistan Country Office		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Tajikistan		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	February 7, 2023		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
Every child survives and thrives	No		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Programme		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	1,4,5,16		
<b>EQA Summary:</b> <i>The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.</i>			
<p>Key strengths of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Findings reflect sufficient levels of evidence to answer each evaluation question at hand and the authors do a great job at making clear where data comes from (e.g., primary or secondary sources).</li> <li>-The report excels at triangulating findings wherever possible.</li> <li>-Conclusions clearly link back to the findings (with finding numbers referenced).</li> <li>-Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose of providing forward-looking recommendations on how to accelerate actions towards reaching the child-protection related targets set in the National Programme for Children 2030 and implementing the recommendations of the 2017 CRC Concluding Observations.</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There are some small areas for improvement that could have likely been addressed via a thorough proofread and copyedit (e.g., spelling/grammar/consistency). These errors largely do not impact the quality of the report, however, the authors should ensure the voracity of their statements prior to finalisation.</li> <li>-The report would benefit from more clearly explaining the evaluation reference group, its members, and its roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>-The report would be strengthened if lessons learnt/good practices and recommendations also included information that would help the reader trace back to the finding(s) or conclusion(s), for example.</li> <li>-The executive summary would benefit from slight restructuring (see comment in D45 and D47).</li> </ul>			
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	50%	Comments on Rating	
<b>Question 1.</b> 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).	Partially	<p>The executive summary is five pages long but is missing key information including conclusions and lessons learnt as well as recommendations that are not high priority. The authors refer readers to those sections, but the information is missing from the executive summary. It is likely that the authors made this choice because of the page length maximum listed in the inception report, but this makes the executive summary unable to be a standalone document that is useful for decision making.</p> <p>The executive summary provides a clear description of evaluation findings. However, the findings summaries within the executive summary have some items that may best belong elsewhere. For example, there are recommendations and some conclusions discussed under 'relevance and design', the opening sentence of 'coherence' appears to relate more closely to effectiveness and these findings are not discussed under effectiveness ('The programme successfully generated significant policy and system level changes that helped to improve policies at national and local levels and support a better protective environment for children.'), the last few sentences of the 'effectiveness' section of the executive summary appear to relate to coherence, and some information presented under efficiency are not findings but conclusions and some recommendations.</p> <p>The executive summary contradicts itself. For example, the effectiveness discussion reveals that 9 of the 14 indicators have been met or exceeded. However, in the efficiency summary, the report states 'Despite the low budget compared to other country programme components, PE programme successfully achieved its planned outcomes.' This is a misleading statement and the wording should have been something like 'achieved a majority of its</p>
	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.	Partially	<p>At times, the executive summary does not include sufficient details to understand the findings themselves.</p> <p>For example, the executive summary highlights that the 2021-2022 work plan included activities/sub-activities, geographical coverage by sub-activity, implementing partners, etc. but that it did not contain information on outputs for all sub-activities which 'can be improved to ease results-oriented management'. From there, the evaluation states that it did not have access to the internal corporate systems but that the results indicate that the programme has a 'highly functional, sufficient, and goal-oriented management system'. It is unclear how the results support this finding. (See full text: 'The work plan for 2021-2022 included activities, sub-activities, geographical coverage by sub-activity, implementing partners, timeline by quarter, and budget information such as amount funded and funds to be mobilised. However, the work plan did not contain information on outputs for all sub-activities, which can be improved to ease results-oriented management. The evaluation team did not have access to the internal corporate systems (e.g., Etools). The results indicate that The programme has a highly functional, sufficient, and goal-oriented management system, grounded on UNICEF's procedures.')</p>
	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.	Partially	<p>The executive summary includes one paragraph summarising the PE programme and provides a very high-level description. This description does not include all significant information needed to understand the intervention.</p> <p>The executive summary includes all significant information needed to understand the evaluation in paragraphs 2-4 of the executive summary.</p>
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		<b>71%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 2.</b>	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	<p>Section 1 provides a clear description of the programme including its location (Tajikistan), cost/budget (USD 7.7 million), and timeline under evaluation (2016-2022), but not the timeline of the programme itself. The report does not provide the implementation status of the programme, but the reader concludes that the programme is continuing on based on the report's references to future planning.</p> <p>The outputs of the programme are presented differently within the report. For example, page 2 states that output 3 is 'By 2022, boys and girls, including those in contact with the law, benefit from programmes that prevent and respond to VAC and a strengthened child-friendly justice system.' while page 3 states outcome 3 as: 'By 2020 children in contact with the law benefit from strengthened justice system.'</p> <p>The report references the three programme outputs as 'by 2020' and 'by 2022' in different places. The supporting documents (e.g., inception report, concept note) do not clarify which year is correct.</p>

	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/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability... (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The report provides an overview of duty bearers in Section 1.2.1 (and refers readers to the ToR for a stakeholder mapping). That said, while rightsholders are also available within the ToR, the report does not provide a clear overview of rightsholders aside from referencing 'children' and 'beneficiaries'. The report would have been stronger if a paragraph explicitly listing the duty bearers and rights holders had been included.
<b>Question 3. Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</b>				
	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.	Partially	The report provides an overview of the economic situation, but does not include available details on violence against children, institutionalisation of children, or background on alternatives to institutionalisation/detention. It also does not discuss the justice system and the extent to which it is child-friendly.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The report identifies SDGs 1,4,5, and 16.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The report provides a very high level description of the status (and alludes to the needs) of rightsholders/beneficiaries, but the report could have gone into more details regarding the specific needs of the most vulnerable children. For example, any data on children with disabilities and institution, and details regarding children with disabilities and violence, etc. The information on the status/needs of the rightsholders is as follows:  'Amid the fallout of the economic and social situation of households, the well-being of children is under pressure, undermining progress diminishing extreme poverty. Although school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic <sup>19</sup> have been limited in Tajikistan, children's education is hindered by an increased exposure to violence and exploitation, such as early marriages, child recruitment to militias, sexual exploitation of girls and young women, teenage pregnancies, and child labour.'
<b>Question 4. Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?</b>				
	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	The report lists implementing agencies and other duty bearers within the final report itself. The report also refers readers to the stakeholder mapping in the ToR.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Section 1.1.2 Purpose of the evaluation includes some details regarding the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders, although it is unclear why this information is contained in Section 1.1.2 nor is it clear how comprehensive of a picture this is.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>				
	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	The evaluation clearly states its purpose, however, the timeline that is laid out in the report references 2021 in the future. It is unclear why the report is written in this tense. (See: 'The evidence and forward-looking recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by the government and UNICEF during implementation of the remaining part of the current country programme as well as to inform the 2023-2027 CP planning process, which will commence in late 2021.')
				There is information under section 1.1.2 Purpose of the evaluation that gives an overview of the programme. Following the three bullet points, the rest of the section would have been more appropriately placed under the main 1.1 Context and intervention.  The report includes justification for 'why now' and includes intended uses and users.
<b>Question 6. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>				
	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	The evaluation report (Section 1.2.2 clearly details the four evaluation objectives). There are no noted changes from the ToR.
	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	The evaluation report clearly describes the scope of the evaluation.
<b>Question 7. Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>				
	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.	Yes	The programme's intended results and intervention logic are available in Section 1.

	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).	Yes	Section 1.1 of the report is a narrative form of the intervention logic.
	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.	Yes	Per the evaluation report: 'The evaluation was based on a theory-based approach to assessing the PE programme and its three core strategic outputs and activities, based on its theory of change (see Annex 2 for the evaluation matrix, and Annex 6 for the ToC in graphic form) as well as complementary documentary evidence including yearly output and outcome statements and country reports.'  Both the final report and the inception report do not reference a revised ToC.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>	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	The evaluation questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation and are aligned to OECD DAC criteria. There are no subquestions listed.
	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.	Yes	The evaluation matrix (available in the inception report and as Annex 2) includes indicators/judgement criteria, data collection methods, and data sources.
<b>Question 9.</b>	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation methods are fully and clearly described. The tools used (document review, phone surveys, online survey, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions) are appropriate for this evaluation. The evaluation team took necessary steps when presented with difficulties (e.g., through increasing number of survey participants due to duplication of phone numbers or non response). The described methodology has some limitations which are detailed in the limitations section. However, overall, the evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust.
	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	Data sources include both quantitative data (from document review and statistical regression) and qualitative data (interviews and surveys). All data sources are clearly described.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategies are described in Section 2.1, but could have been more clearly presented to remove duplication of information. The phone survey strategy involved a random sampling based on a list provided by UNICEF based on defined criteria (note that the defined criteria is not defined in the final report or inception report and this information would have been useful to include). When non-operational phone numbers and duplicate phone numbers were discovered in the selected sample, the evaluation team resampled from the list (excluding the phone numbers that had been selected). The online survey strategy and phone interview included making the survey available in three languages to increase participation among respondents. All sampling strategies employed random sampling and the authors clearly note the limitations of the sampling strategies (see: 'The online survey and key-informant interview participants also came from a list of stakeholders provided by the programme staff. Although the random-sampling procedure could help to mitigate selection bias in the phone interviews, the evaluation team could only assume that the reference lists of beneficiaries and stakeholders provided by the programme staff was representative of the total beneficiaries and stakeholders.') The authors also expand on why there may have been potential limitations of the outreach to highly vulnerable groups (see limitation #3).
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The report fully meets this criterion. (Section 2.1 clearly describes the data collection and analysis methods.)
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	By drawing on a mixed-methods approach, the evaluation is able to draw some causal links between programme outputs and outcomes through triangulation of data.
	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	The report includes a detailed list of constraints and limitations alongside mitigation efforts where they were employed.

<b>Question 10.</b>	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 UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	Section 2.3 references UNEG obligations and other principles relevant to ethical standards.
	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.	Yes	The evaluation report clearly describes the ethical safeguards for participants and these are provided in a more detailed manner in the annexes. The evaluation followed the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children and the inception report and questionnaires as well as informed consent/assent forms and protection protocols went through an external ethical review commissioned by UNICEF from an independent contractor.
<b>Question 11.</b>	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Partially	The evaluation utilises a scoring structure that is used by the evaluation team as well as the duty bearers and rights holders. It is unclear whether this is an innovative practice (so 'partially' score is given). See Section 3 introduction.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 12.</b>	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	Findings reflect sufficient levels of evidence to answer each evaluation question at hand and the authors do a great job at making clear where data comes from (e.g., primary or secondary sources). The report excels at triangulating findings wherever possible.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Findings often reflect on the programme's TOC but are structured around OECD DAC criteria.
<b>Question 13.</b>	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	The evaluation report's presentation allows readers to readily understand how findings have been triangulated. The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative (e.g., rightsholders and duty bearers) and quantitative data (i.e., desk review documentation).
	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	The report fully meets this criterion. The evaluation report clearly presents evidence (both primary and secondary) to formulate findings via triangulation.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The evaluation report clearly presents evidence (both primary and secondary) to formulate findings via triangulation. The findings section includes a discussion regarding the underlying assumptions of the ToC (see finding EQ15).
<b>Question 14.</b>	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) to support decision-making.	Yes	EQ14 and EQ15 discuss the adequacy of the programme's monitoring system.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 15.</b>	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	The conclusions section is thoughtfully written in a way that reflects on the major findings of the evaluation as well as the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. As a whole, the conclusions section is sufficiently forward looking.
	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	Each conclusion lists the corresponding finding(s) and presents/weights both strengths and weaknesses of the programme. In doing so, the conclusions offer insight beyond the disparate findings.
<b>Question 16.</b>	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.	Yes	While the lessons stem logically from the findings, the report would have benefited from listing the specific findings as was done for the conclusions section. The highlighted lessons have the potential to be applicable beyond the evaluand.

	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	Lessons learnt are concisely presented but give enough detail to be useful (and give the reader enough detail to refer to the associated findings for more information). As stated above, the report would have had a stronger presentation if lessons learnt were clearly linked to findings, as was done for the conclusions section.
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>	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.	Yes	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose of providing forward-looking recommendations on how to accelerate actions towards reaching the child-protection related targets set in the National Programme for Children 2030 and implementing the recommendations of the 2017 CRC Concluding Observations .
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The evaluation report contains thoughtful, actionable recommendations that appear to be useful to the intended party. Some recommendations include specific guidance for implementation (e.g., recommendation 2: 'Develop a specific gender-action plan for the programme including specific activities and targets/indicators to track progress. We recommend explicit reference to the specific cross-cutting issues in the theory of changes of future programmes, to clarify which aspects they intend to address, including specific activities (inputs).')
			The report would be further strengthened if each recommendation was traced back to a lesson learnt/conclusion for easier reference.
	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).	Yes	The report indicates that recommendations have been 'developed based on consultations and involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders through the online survey, phone survey, key informant interviews and focus-group discussions, which included questions about their main suggestions for improvement' and that the recommendations were shared and discussed with the country office through the evaluation reference group.
<b>Question 18.</b>	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.	Yes	The recommendations section clearly identifies the group(s) that is/are responsible for implementing each recommendation. The recommendations have been prioritised from low to high.
<b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 19.</b>	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.	Yes	The evaluation report meets most of the requirements listed in B113. However, the report is missing the timeframe of the evaluation (as written, only the published data is available in the opening pages). The timeframe of the evaluation is discussed in both the executive summary and the first paragraph of Section 1 Introduction.
	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), 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, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	The link titled 'annexes' brings you to a page with the titles of each annex. It would have been beneficial to include a list of the annexes following the table of context for easier reference. The annexes included are all listed in cell B12 except for a list of site visits.
<b>Question 20.</b>	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	The structure is easy to navigate and is clearly titled.
	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.	Yes	The structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.
<b>Question 21.</b>	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	The report is of a reasonable length (with more detailed information annexed) and does not exceed the 60 pages specified in the inception report.

	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	Overall, the report is well written and easy to understand. There are still some minor spelling errors (e.g., analyses) and some areas that appear to have formatting leftover from accepting track changes. There are many instances where sentences have an unnecessarily capitalised letter or an uncapitalised first word. This may be due to accepting track changes and not performing a thorough proofread and copyedit (examples follow). In future, all evaluation reports should undergo a thorough proofread and copyedit for grammar/spelling as well as small inconsistencies.  'In line with the recommendation 2, A specific gender action plan for the PE programme...' 'The results indicate that The programme has a highly functional, sufficient, and...' 'A full list is available in chapter 5. lessons learnt and best practices are presented following the conclusions in chapter 6.'
	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	The body of the report and the annexes frequently use visual aids to help convey information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>			<b>62%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 22.</b>		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, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluation employed a rights-based framework while designing and undertaking the assignment.
	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).	Partially	The evaluation report references an interagency Evaluation Reference Group established by the government of Tajikistan for this evaluation as well as a reference group composed of youth for the evaluation. In some parts of the report, there is no indication of which reference group is being referenced. The report would benefit from more clearly laying out the different reference group actors and their roles and responsibilities. As written, their purpose and roles are unclear.  The roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders could also be more clearly stated in its own section or as an annex that is referenced within the body of the report.
	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	The report uses appropriate language throughout.
	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	The evaluation utilises data gathered by the approved evaluation questions regarding the extent to which the implementation of the intervention may address child rights and leave no one behind. The evaluation lacks details regarding disability inclusiveness.
<b>Question 23.</b>		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	<b>4</b>	
	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.	Partially integrated	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>No.</b> b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? <b>The evaluation does not include an objective specific to the assessment of human rights and gender equality. However, the evaluation focuses on the most vulnerable children.</b> c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? <b>Gender and/or human rights was not a standalone criterion. However, issues around gender were discussed in a few evaluation questions. Human rights is mainstreamed throughout the evaluation.</b> d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? <b>Yes.</b>

ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	<p>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>No.</b></p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations? <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? <b>Partially (detailed reasons why are located in the limitations section of the report).</b></p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? <b>Yes.</b></p>
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	<p><b>The evaluation included questions (e.g., 3,4) that allowed for a gender analysis of evaluation findings related to programme structure and performance. The evaluation conclusions and recommendations stem from these evaluation findings and include some language and analysis regarding gender.</b></p> <p>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>No.</b></p> <p>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? <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? <b>No.</b></p>

#### 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?