

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Evaluation of the Inclusive Education programme

### REPORT RATING SUMMARY

<b>Overall Rating</b>	56%	Fair	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	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.
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

### REPORT DETAILS

<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Evaluation of the Inclusive Education programme
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Jordan/59/2022/17102
<b>Region</b>	MENA
<b>Year of report</b>	2022
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Jordan
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Jordan
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	January 20, 2023
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC

### CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT

<b>Management of evaluation</b> ( <i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation</i> )	UNICEF managed
<b>Unicef goal areas</b> ( <i>Alignment with strategic plan priorities</i> )	
Every child survives and thrives	Yes
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	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Programme
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Formative
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods
<b>Evaluation design</b> ( <i>primary method used</i> )	Participatory
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered</b> ( <i>number</i> )	4

**EQA Summary:** *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.*

**Key strengths:**

- Clear description of the data collection strategy and methods of analysis. Overall the methodology is clearly presented (and complemented in the inception report) and should be robust enough to meet the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
- Clear presentation of limitations
- Outstanding description of ethical considerations and safeguards
- The report has a clear structure and uses clear and accessible language. It has a good flow and makes a decent use of visuals.
- HRBA incorporated in the evaluation design.
- Disability issues are at the core of the evaluation

**Main weaknesses observed:**

- The description of the object could be enhanced by adding information about a number of issues such as a) timeframe of the project; b) budget c) a clearer and comprehensive presentation of the different outputs and outcomes in the logframe; d) a clearer definition of stakeholders and of their specific roles and contribution to the programme and, ideally, some information about the governance and management arrangements of the programme.
- The specific needs that the programmes is aiming to address could be made clear in the descriptive chapter. Ideally, some reference to the main (or more common) needs of the schools participating in the project and a description of the different types of disabilities present/covered in those would be appreciated.
- Inconsistent use of data to support findings. Data sources not always clearly identified when presenting findings.
- Weak conclusions. Some concluding remarks are found throughout the report but section 6 could be revisited to bring in some of those in an articulated manner that wraps up the report with key takeaways and clear evaluative judgments for the different areas of enquiry.
- Lessons learned should also be revisited to make linkages to findings more explicit.
- Recommendations do not always visibly build on findings. This should be made clearer. Introducing new information at this point should be avoided
- Data insufficiently disaggregated throughout the report
- Weak analysis of GEEW issues.

**Recommendations for Improvement:** *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.*

Areas that could be enhanced:

-Section 2 should be strengthened so that the reader gets a more detailed and complete picture of the intervention evaluated. This includes for example, an explicit indication of the timeframe of the project (when did it start, milestones). This should also be linked to the scope criteria: ideally, the report should make clear if the whole duration of the programme is covered or not. Most importantly, section 2.2 should include additional information about the project outputs and outcomes (or include the original logframe amend the annexes). Other useful information that should be added: a) programme budget and sources of funding; b) a clearer presentation of stakeholders and their specific roles and contribution to the programme and, ideally, some information about the governance and management arrangements of the programme.

-In section 2 (context) I would suggest to include some information about the specific needs that the programmes is aiming to address as they were identified in the formulation phase. Ideally, some reference to the main (or more common) needs of the participants schools and a description of the different disabilities present in those would be appreciated.

-The analytical process could be made more consistently visible and the use of data to support findings clearer. Although the report includes a few examples of triangulation this is not consistent in the report. Data sources should be made more visible.

-Overall, the analysis could make further use of disaggregated data.

- The conclusions section should be re drafted to bring in some of the concluding remarks found throughout the report in a more articulated manner. I would suggest that conclusions are structured along the evaluation criteria or EQ and that in each case the main takeaways are reflected. Overall, this section should give a quick picture of those areas of success and those areas where the programme has been weaker.

-Lessons learned should also be revisited to make linkages to findings more explicit.

-Recommendations should build on the findings and make sure that they are not introducing new information.

- GEEW issues should be given further consideration. Have the evaluators observed any differences between what was implemented or achieved in female schools when compared to male schools, for example? Has the programme sufficiently consider GEEW aspects in the implementation of the different activities?

## SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	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	The executive summary reproduces all the sections in the report but several of them are rather succinct and would require additional information to serve as a standalone document (object of evaluation and findings for instance). Instead, the recommendations section seems to be reproduces in its integrity. The ES is 5 pages long exactly and meets the length criterium.
	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.	Yes	All elements are duly covered.
	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	The summary provides very succinct information about the project. Expanding this part would be helpful. New information not included.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	43%	Comments on Rating
<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.	Partially	The evaluators explain that a ToC is not provided as per the ToR. The report reproduces the main specific objectives of the intervention and complements the information with a table (annex 8.) that presents the main achievements of the programme but fails to make a clear identification of the outputs and outcomes in the logframe. Reproducing the original results framework or providing it as an annex would have been useful. It is also clear that the programme has been implemented in 102 schools (although the inception report indicates 100) and that 37 have been handed over to the Ministry already but the reader does not get information about when it started and with what planned duration (this needs to be inferred from other parts of the report and it is not always easy). Other aspects of the programme (budget, governance and management arrangements and, most importantly, the timelines of the project) not described. The overall budget of the programme not included in the inception report either.
	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 does not include a stakeholders' map. A brief reference to the number of educators, children and parents is useful. The intended rightsholders and duty bearers are identified.
<b>Question 3.</b>	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.	Partially	The description of the context is rather brief. A positive aspect is that it provides a clear description of other coetaneous initiatives in support of implementing the National Inclusive Education Strategy. The main components of the NIES are described but other key aspects such as, for example, the budget framework or the key aspects of the operationalization of the strategy are not presented. The inception report complements this information with a more extensive description of both the global and the local contexts and provides some basic statistics about children with disabilities in the school system at national level.

	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	SDG 4 is briefly mentioned in the Executive summary where the report states that "inclusive education became a means to achieving the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 - "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong opportunities for all". No further references or linkages found in the report.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The status and needs of the stakeholders come out from the report but these are not clearly presented. It would have been useful to present the key features of a need assessment (or similar) if conducted by the project. As it is, the reader gets some understanding of the needs that the project is trying to address but these could have been better formulated and contextualised.
<b>Question 4.</b>		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).	Partially	The report indicates that UNICEF, Mercy Corps and the Ministry of Education are the key stakeholders involved in the implementation of the programme but, as mentioned, there is no clear presentation of stakeholders and/or of the stakeholders' map. No information about how these stakeholders interact and coordinate. Right holders come out rather clearly from the report.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	No	The specific contributions of key stakeholders tasked with the implementation of the programme are not described and need to be inferred from the report which requires a lot of effort. Financial contributions not identified.
<b>SECTION C:</b>		<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>		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.	Partially	The report makes a clear presentation of the purpose of the evaluation and identifies the main intended uses. No indication of primary users of the evaluation. Is it only going to serve UNICEF or also MoE?
<b>Question 6.</b>		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).	Partially	The report reproduces two out of the three objectives included in the ToR without clearly explaining why the third objectives has been left out. Other divergences with ToR explained in the IR, but should have been included in the report.
	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).	Partially	Very clear programmatic scope. No indication of time frame or geographic scope of the evaluation. The inception report does not help much with these two aspects. About the geographic scope, we understand that the evaluation covers the whole country (and all the schools in the programme) but this could be made explicit in the report. On the temporal scope it seems that the evaluation is focusing on years 2017-2019 but this is never clearly indicated and has to be interpreted by the reader.
<b>Question 7.</b>		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	The report describes the specific objectives of the programme but does not include a clear and comprehensive description of its results framework and annex 8.8 does not clearly present results per outcome and output.
	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	The report does not include a ToC nor does it make an attempt to reconstruct that. This is justified as "the scope of the evaluation was based on the outputs and outcomes of the programme as required by the Terms of Reference". As the results framework is insufficiently described (see above) this means that it is not possible to understand causal relationships or to identify the main underlying assumptions of the intervention.
	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	As this was not requested in the ToR the criteria is not rated.
<b>SECTION D:</b>		<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>83%</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 report reproduces the questions as per the ToR with minor changes (divergences from ToR explained in the inception report). The list of questions and sub-questions is later used to frame findings. Questions and sub-questions correspond with the needs of the study.

	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.	Not Rated	An evaluation matrix is mentioned and included in the list of annexes but it is provided in a separate document not available to the reviewer. This standard is therefore left unrated.
<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 uses a mostly qualitative and participatory approach. The number of KII is relatively small but meets the requirements in the ToR. Furthermore, consultations with the main beneficiaries of the programme (schools) are extensive and make up for that. Some quantitative data gathered through a survey. The evaluation design is fit for the purpose and robust enough.
	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	The evaluation design allows for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. Data sources selected are appropriate. Lists of people interviewed, schools visited and documents consulted included among the annexes.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The selection criteria and composition of FGD are clearly explained in the inception report but not in the report. A brief reference or call to the IR would have been useful. No indication about how KII participants have been selected. We interpret that it was via purposeful sampling but this should have been mentioned.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	section 4.3.2 provides a clear description of the methods of analysis used.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Not Rated	The evaluation matrix is included among the annexes but not available to the reviewer (in a separate document) and this aspect is difficult to rate. Without a clear ToC or a more narrative presentation of the chain of results it is difficult to know to what extent the evaluation has been designed to facilitate the identification and assessment of causal connections.
	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	Limitations and mitigation measures clearly presented in a specific section and used in the report to explain the inability of the evaluators to analyse some of the aspects in the ToR.
<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 4.3.3 makes clear and full elaboration of ethical principles applied in the evaluation. UNICEF Procedures for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis referenced.
	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	Ethical safeguards extensively considered and reflected in the report, the IR and the annexes.
<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.	No	The evaluation uses standard methods. No evidence of use of innovative approaches
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>			50%	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.	Partially	Not all questions are answered in the evaluation (cost-effectiveness analysis for example). This is explained in the report. All other questions are addressed and the issues analysed. However, the quality of the analysis is rather variable depending on the issue and the presentation of the evidence gathered and used to reach findings is inconsistent.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	Findings are articulated along the evaluation questions and criteria and there is little visible reference to specific outcomes or outputs in the logframe.
<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.	Partially	The analysis is mostly based on quantitative data gathered through the survey (results frequently used to illustrate findings) and qualitative data collected in KII and FGD. Triangulation is not always evident and overall the analytical process could be made more transparent for the reader to join the dots between the data and the findings.

	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.	Partially	Findings are inconsistently supported with data but are reasonably credible. Annex 8.8 includes a table of achievements against the result framework but a) the annex is not totally clear about the structure of outcomes and outputs and b) it does not include benchmarks or baseline targets. Little reference to those benchmarks in the analysis.
	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).	Partially	Causal factors are clearly identified as they were clearly demanded in the evaluation questions in the ToR. In some cases it is not clear the data sources used to identify those factors. In others, factors seem to derive from the evaluator's personal experience or expertise. This could have been made explicit to enhance the credibility of the analysis.
<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.	Not Rated	The report does not include an analysis of the M&E system and processes. As this was not requested in the ToR we leave this unrated.
<b>SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>		<b>38%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<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).	Partially	The report includes a rather concise section 6 (1 page) that presents both conclusions and recommendations. Although 3 conclusions are announced only two are reflected in the report. The formulation of conclusions is of poor quality (the first one formulated as a recommendation)
	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.	No	Conclusions are not clearly linked to the analysis and fail to use the findings to provide clear answers to the different evaluation questions or criteria. This is because, we believe, there is a confusion between findings and conclusions (some of the statements in the findings section read as concluding remarks). The section fails to present a clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. This needs to be extracted from other sections in the report. Conclusions should use the information gathered and the findings reached to present higher level judgments on the merits of a programme. This does not happen here.
<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.	Partially	As mentioned, lessons learned are presented together with conclusions. 3 lessons are identified. The second one raises an issue not clearly addressed earlier in the report. Linkages with findings are weak.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	Only lesson 3 may bring an interesting point to the table. Overall lessons are excessively concise and weakly linked to the findings.
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		<b>38%</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.	Partially	Linkages to findings are blurry in most cases. Some aspects (for example M&E system) that are suggested as areas of improvement were not included in the analysis. New information tends to appear in the recommendations, which is not good practice (for example R8 mentions SDDP school or directorate level committees, structures that do not appear earlier in the report).
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	No	Overall, not much guidance is provided. For example, R 5 suggests that the programme should "Develop a mechanism through which teachers, parents and other professionals work collaboratively on the development and implementation of Individual Education Plans (IEP's) for students with disabilities" but does not provide any detail about how this should be done.
	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	There is no information about the involvement of those stakeholders in the formulation of recommendations. The only mention is that their perspectives have been considered in the formulation. The report does not clarify if the evaluation reference group was convened (no mention of this in the ToR either). As a result, it seems that involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation is mostly extractive and that they have had no role in the formulation of recommendations.
<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	Responsibilities for implementation of recommendations are assigned. The urgency and priority of recommendations is clearly identified.
<b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>		<b>86%</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.	Partially	The front page includes the title of the intervention, the names of organizations commissioning and implementing the evaluation, the date of the report and the location (Jordan). The timeframe of the evaluation is not indicated. The is a comprehensive table of contents. Acronyms are also presented.
	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.	Partially	The report includes 16 annexes, some of which are provided as separate documents (and therefore not available to the external audience). This applies for example to the evaluation matrix and the ToR. All other elements are included.
<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 report follows a standard structure and shows no formatting or editing problems. It is easy to navigate.
	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 follows UNICEF guidelines.
<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 reasonable length (46 pages). As the ToR did not include any specific requirement this standard is considered met.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is clearly written and is accessible to wider audiences. No typos or editing problems detected.
	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 report often uses graphic elements, tables and infographics (see figure 3) that are useful and facilitate reading. They are clearly presented.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>57%</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 report claims that "This evaluation was set on the HRB normative standards, as well as upon the working motto of the CRPD and the disability movement "Nothing About Us Without Us" and it makes several references to CRC and CRPD. Section 5.1.4 addresses to what extent is the IE (Inclusive Education) Programme aligned with global practices (CRC, CRPD...)
	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 level of participation of both right-holders and duty bearers in the implementation of the evaluation is clearly explained in the methodological chapter. However, their participation seems to be very much limited to being informants for the evaluation. There is no mention of a reference group or evidence of participation of right holders in the process beyond their role as data sources. The report mentions regular follow-up meetings with the programme manager from MC and the MoE concerned department were conducted but it is not clear to what extent those meetings have genuinely involved duty bearers in the evaluation.
	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).	Partially	The reports makes decent use of HRB language but presents very little disaggregation of data.
	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.	Yes	The report says: "This evaluation was set on the HRB normative standards, as well as upon the working motto of the CRPD and the disability movement "Nothing About Us Without Us" and includes, as main stakeholders, the rights-holders of the programme being evaluated. Thus, children with disabilities, their parents, and teachers are the backbone of this evaluation and provided essential information in response to the evaluation questions and sub-questions.
<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)	3	
	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	The table of evaluation questions is gender blind and does not include specific GEEW questions or criteria. Only on sub-question (relevance) requires some sort of analysis of gender equality issues.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	Some attention to including a fair representation of female and male students has been made. Although some further indication of specific gender-sensitive measures implemented (for example precautions made to ensure participation of mothers in the evaluation) would have been appreciated the information available suggests that GEEW issues have been taken into consideration to a satisfactory level.

iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Not at all integrated	Reflections about GEEW aspects are scarce. Although we find some references in section 5.1.2 (To what extent does the IE programme reflect the gender, equity, and human rights-based approach?) the analysis lacks depth and is very much limited to describing how the gender criteria applied to the selection of schools. Some statistics about how disabilities affect both male and female presented in the context section. Overall gender aspects are not analysed or reflected in the findings, conclusions or recommendations. Little use of sex-disaggregated data throughout the report.
-----	---	-----------------------	--

#### SWAP Rating Guidance

<p><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.</b></p> <p>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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</b></p> <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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</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?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p><b>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</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?</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?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>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?</p>