

## Annex C: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation questions	Sub Question	Indicators / Measures	Data collection methods	Data analysis technique	Data sources
<b>Relevance</b>					
EQ 1. To what extent are the objectives, pre-conditions, pathways, change strategies/approaches, implementation modalities of the Child Protection Programme, (still) valid and respond to the current needs, priorities and policies of the relevant national and sub-national stakeholders, and rights holders?	EQ 1.1 To what extent are the objectives, pre-conditions, pathways, change strategies/approaches, implementation modalities of the Child Protection Programme, (still) valid and respond to the current needs, priorities and policies of the relevant <i>national stakeholders</i> ?	- (Number and type of) instances where CP programme objectives, approaches and interventions reflect national priorities on VAC prevention and response ( <i>qualitative</i> ); - Degree to which national priorities on VAC prevention and response are prioritised <sup>1</sup> in the CP programme (low priority/medium priority/high priority) ( <i>qualitative</i> ).	Document review; Key informant interviews (national)	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding); Descriptive analysis of programme strategies and design and results achieved (as captured by indicators).	- Programme documents setting out programme's strategic approach and Theory of Change (particularly the Child Protection Programme Strategy Note of December 2018); - Programme materials including websites and social media platforms; - Philippines National Development Plan - GoP Policies and Strategies on VAC and Child Protection; - UNICEF Strategic Plans; - Key informant interviews with government counterparts, UNICEF staff members and
	EQ 1.2 To what extent are the objectives, pre-conditions, pathways, change strategies/approaches, implementation modalities of the Child Protection Programme, (still) valid and respond to the current needs, priorities and	- (Number and type of) instances where CP programme objectives, approaches and interventions reflect priorities on VAC prevention and response for sub-national governments in UNICEF programming areas ( <i>qualitative</i> ); - Degree to which sub-national government priorities in	Document review; Key informant interviews (national and sub-national)		

<sup>1</sup> Level of priority will be measured by assessing emphasis placed on a particular programme component (resources and attention devoted to it, whether it is viewed as important by stakeholders, etc).

	policies of the relevant <i>sub-national stakeholders</i> ?	UNICEF programming areas on VAC prevention and response are prioritised <sup>2</sup> in the CP programme (low priority/medium priority/high priority) ( <i>qualitative</i> ).			implementing partners.
	EQ 1.3 To what extent are the objectives, change strategies/approaches, implementation modalities of the Child Protection Programmes, still valid and respond to the current needs, priorities and policies of the relevant <i>rights holders</i> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Number and type of) instances where CP programme objectives, approaches and interventions reflect needs of rights holders on VAC prevention and response (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which where CP programme objectives, approaches and interventions reflect priorities of rights holders on VAC prevention and response (<i>qualitative</i>), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Extent to which CP programme objectives, approaches and interventions are based on robust evidence (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>○ Level of active participation reported by beneficiaries and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Literature review; Document review; Key informant interviews (national and sub-national); Beneficiary interviews.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory) Descriptive analysis of beneficiary demographic profiles (frequencies).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme documents setting out programme's strategic approach and Theory of Change (particularly the Child Protection Programme Strategy Note of December 2018);</li> <li>- Programme materials including websites and social media platforms;</li> <li>- UNICEF Strategic Plans;</li> <li>- Data and analysis on VAC and CP in the Philippines (analysis of existing data sets (e.g. DHS) to identify need);</li> <li>- Monitoring data on delivery of prevention and response services;</li> <li>- Qualitative interviews with children and adolescents, case</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Level of priority will be measured by assessing emphasis placed on a particular programme component (resources and attention devoted to it, whether it is viewed as important by stakeholders, etc).

		<p>services providers (<i>qualitative</i>);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number<sup>3</sup> and type of examples where activities / interventions / services have incorporated feedback from beneficiaries, particularly (vulnerable) children adolescents (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>			<p>workers/service providers, family members, caretakers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Case file reviews;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with government counterparts, UNICEF staff members, implementing partners and beneficiaries.</li> </ul>
<b>Coherence</b>					
EQ 2. To what extent is the PCO Child Protection Programme aligned with the Philippines Development Plan (PDP) and the SDGs?	EQ 2.1 To what extent is the CP Programme aligned with the PDP?	<i>(see above, EQ 1.1)</i>	<i>(see above, EQ 1.1)</i>	<i>(see above, EQ 1.1)</i>	<i>(see above, EQ 1.1)</i>
	EQ 2.2 To what extent is the CP Programme aligned with the SDGs?	- (Number and type of) instances where CP programme approaches and interventions reflect SDGs	Document review; Key informant interviews.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding)	-SDGs; - Programme documents setting out programme's strategic approach and Theory of Change (particularly the Child Protection Programme Strategy Note of December 2018); - UNICEF Strategic Plans;

<sup>3</sup> We will describe examples of programme interventions that have incorporated feedback from beneficiaries, but do not necessarily expect to report on this numerically in the evaluation.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UN planning documents;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with government counterparts, UNICEF staff members, implementing partners and beneficiaries.</li> </ul>
<p>EQ 3. To what extent is the CP Programme consistent with other actors' interventions in the same context? (Including complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort)</p>	<p>EQ 3.1 To what extent has the CP Programme been informed by and consistent with the interventions of child protection development actors?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Type of UNICEF commitments made to development agencies working in the Philippines Child Protection Sector (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which the strategic priorities of development agencies working in the Philippines Child Protection Sector have been prioritised<sup>4</sup> in the CP programme (low priority/medium priority/high priority) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> <li>- Degree to which the CP Programme is consistent with the priorities and activities of development partners working on child protection (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Descriptive analysis of programme strategies and design against analysis of priorities and activities of key development partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNICEF's programme and planning documents;</li> <li>- UN planning documents</li> <li>- Planning documents of development agencies working in the Philippines Child Protection Sector</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, development partners and government counterparts.</li> </ul>
	<p>EQ 3.2 To what extent has the child protection programme complemented / added value to the efforts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Degree of complementarity between UNICEF and UNICEF CP Programme and other child protection development partners (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews.</p>		

<sup>4</sup> Level of priority will be measured by assessing emphasis placed on a particular programme component (resources and attention devoted to it, whether it is viewed as important by stakeholders, etc).

	of other development partners?				
	EQ 3.3 To what extent has the child protection programme duplicated or detracted from the efforts of other development partners?	- Degree of duplication between UNICEF and UNICEF CP Programme and other child protection development partners ( <i>qualitative</i> ).	Document review; Key informant interviews.		
<b>Effectiveness</b>					
EQ 4. To what extent were the desired results of the Child Protection Programme achieved on the protection of girls and boys (covering six programme areas/outputs) as per the country programme documents and subsequent annual work plans? To what extent and how can the results be attributed to the Child Protection Programme (i.e., UNICEF's contribution)? What were the major factors influencing these results? NOTE that we have merged the three 'effectiveness' questions from the TOR into one as they are quite dependent / connected and, in our view, would best be	EQ 4.1 To what extent did the Child Protection Programme's interventions contribute to the intended results on the reform of child protection policy and legislation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results achieved;</li> <li>○ Change strategies;</li> <li>○ UNICEF contribution.</li> </ul>	- Results achieved <sup>5</sup> on the reform of policy and legislation at national and sub-national level in line with ( <i>qualitative and quantitative</i> ); - Number and type of adjustments and changes to policy, institutional and legal framework in the Philippines made during the implementation of the programme and which relate to UNICEF's advocacy efforts ( <i>qualitative</i> ); - Any remaining gaps between the policy, institutional and legal framework in the Philippines and the UNCRC (including its optional protocols) ( <i>qualitative</i> ); - Change strategies utilised ( <i>qualitative</i> );	Document review; Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.	Legal analysis of the Philippines' legal and institutional framework as compared to international and regional standards; Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Inferential analysis to determine underlying factors associated with particular outcomes.	- International laws on child protection; Philippines child protection laws, policies and guidance; - UNICEF Country Programme Documents (2012 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023) and annual work plans (2017 – 2020); - Government administrative data on child protection services (disaggregated by gender, age, type of case, outcome, etc); - Key informant interviews (at national, regional and local levels);

<sup>5</sup> See results under CPD 2012-2018 Output 3 and under CPD 2019-2023 Output 3.1.

<p>considered under one overarching question.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partnerships utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which UNICEF’s change strategies contributed to these / nature of UNICEF’s contribution (e.g., were changes a result of UNICEF advocacy, technical support, use of relevant change strategies, etc and how did UNICEF technical support influence outcomes) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Focus group discussions;</li> <li>- In-depth interviews;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> </ul>
	<p>EQ 4.2 To what extent did the Child Protection Programme’s interventions contribute to the intended results on child protection system strengthening?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Results achieved;</li> <li>o Change strategies;</li> <li>o UNICEF contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results achieved<sup>6</sup> on strengthening of child protection system;</li> <li>- Number and proportion of intended results that have been achieved;</li> <li>- Degree to which child protection system and services are provided in line with best practice in UNICEF programming areas (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which services provided effectively addressed underlying protection needs and resolved cases in UNICEF programming areas (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Change strategies utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews (national, regional and local); In-depth beneficiary interviews; Case file reviews; Service provider survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Descriptive analysis of beneficiary profiles (frequencies); Inferential analysis to determine underlying factors associated with particular outcomes; Comparative analysis of results in intervention and non-intervention sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International guidance and best practice on child protection system strengthening</li> <li>- UNICEF Country Programme Documents (2012 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023) and annual work plans (2017 – 2020);</li> <li>- Government administrative data on child protection services in UNICEF programme areas (disaggregated by gender, age, type of case, outcome, etc);</li> <li>- Key informant interviews (at national,</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> See results under CPD 2019 – 2023 Output 3.2.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partnerships utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in child protection system and service provision resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in outcomes of child protection services resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>).</li> <li>- Degree to which UNICEF contributed to these / nature of UNICEF's contribution (e.g. were changes a result of UNICEF technical and/or financial support and how did UNICEF support influence outcomes) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>regional and local levels);</li> <li>- In-depth beneficiary interviews;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> </ul>
	<p>EQ 4.3 To what extent did the Child Protection Programme's interventions contribute to the intended results on community attitudes and behaviours?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results achieved;</li> <li>○ Change strategies;</li> <li>○ UNICEF contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results achieved<sup>7</sup> on the community attitudes and behaviours (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Number and proportion of intended results that have been achieved (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Proportion of parents and service providers that demonstrate improved attitudes on violence in communities which received community mobilisation and social norm/behaviour change interventions, as compared to</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews (national, regional and local); In-depth beneficiary interviews; Service provider survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Inferential analysis to determine underlying factors associated with particular outcomes; Analysis of results in intervention sites. Comparative analysis (considering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNICEF Country Programme Documents (2012 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023) and annual work plans (2017 – 2020);</li> <li>- Government administrative data on child protection services (disaggregated by gender, age, type of case, outcome, etc);</li> <li>- Key informant interviews (at national, regional and local levels);</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> See results under CPD 2012 – 2018 Output 3 and CPD 2019 – 2023 Output 3.4.

		<p>communities which had not (<i>quantitative</i>);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proportion of the community (parents, service providers) that have reported improved practices and behaviours (in relation to violence against children in communities which received community mobilisation and social norm/behaviour change interventions, as compared to communities which had not (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Number and type of changes in attitudes, practices and behaviours attributed to mobilisation efforts supported by UNICEF (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which UNICEF contributed to these / nature of UNICEF's contribution (e.g., were changes a result of UNICEF technical and/or financial support and how did UNICEF support influence outcomes) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>		<p>differences in attitude and behaviour change in programme and non programme sites);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Focus group discussions with community members (if possible);</li> <li>- In-depth beneficiary interviews;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--	--	--

	<p>EQ 4.4 To what extent did the Child Protection Programme’s interventions contribute to the intended results on strengthened coordination mechanisms and approaches to enhance parenting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results achieved;</li> <li>○ Change strategies;</li> <li>○ UNICEF contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results achieved<sup>8</sup> on the community attitudes and behaviours (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Number and proportion of intended results that have been achieved (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Type of changes in attitudes, practices and behaviours attributed to mobilisation efforts supported by UNICEF (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which UNICEF contributed to these / nature of UNICEF’s contribution (e.g., were changes a result of UNICEF technical and/or financial support and how did UNICEF support influence outcomes) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews (national, regional and local); In-depth beneficiary interviews; Service provider (SP) survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Document review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNICEF Country Programme Documents (2012 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023) and annual work plans (2017 – 2020);</li> <li>- Government administrative data on child protection services (disaggregated by gender, age, type of case, outcome, etc);</li> <li>- Key informant interviews (at national, regional and local levels);</li> <li>- In-depth beneficiary interviews;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> </ul>
	<p>EQ 4.5. To what extent did the Child Protection Programme contribute to the intended results for children and adolescents affected by armed conflict?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nature and type of barriers that prevent adolescents affected by disasters and armed conflict from accessing services;</li> <li>- Programme approaches to addressing barriers during implementation;</li> <li>- Nature and type of barriers that have been overcome or reduced as a result of UNICEF’s programming (and explanatory analysis of how UNICEF’s programming reduced these).</li> </ul>	<p>Key informant interviews; Life history interviews; Case file reviews; Focus group discussions; Service provider survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Descriptive analysis of quantitative data.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring Reporting Mechanism Information Management System</li> <li>- Information Management System (CFSI)</li> <li>- National statistical data on child protection risks (child protection Baseline Research Summary Report; Rapid</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> See results under CPD 2012 – 2018 Output 3 and CPD 2019 – 2023 Output 3.4.

					<p>Assessment of Child Protection);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Government administrative data on child protection and child protection services (see for example Children need rights not rites: Data gallery 2017);</li><li>- Key informant interviews, particularly with social workers and other service providers;</li><li>- In-depth interviews with children and families / caretakers who have received a child protection response;</li><li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>EQ 4.6. To what extent did the Child Protection Programme contribute to the intended results for strengthened capacities of the child protection system (services, families and communities) to protect at-risk children and adolescents in BARMM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results achieved;</li> <li>○ Change strategies;</li> <li>○ UNICEF contribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results achieved<sup>9</sup> on strengthening of child protection system in BARRM;</li> <li>- Number and proportion of intended results that have been achieved;</li> <li>- Degree to which child protection system and services are provided in line with best practice in UNICEF programming areas (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which services provided effectively addressed underlying protection needs and resolved cases in UNICEF programming areas (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Change strategies utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Partnerships utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in child protection system and service provision resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in outcomes of child protection services resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>).</li> <li>- Degree to which UNICEF contributed to these / nature of UNICEF's contribution (e.g. were changes a result of</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews (national, regional and local); In-depth beneficiary interviews; Case file reviews; Service provider (SP) survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Descriptive analysis of beneficiary profiles (frequencies); Inferential analysis to determine underlying factors associated with particular outcomes; Comparative analysis of results in intervention and non-intervention sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International guidance and best practice on child protection system strengthening</li> <li>- UNICEF Country Programme Documents (2012 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023) and annual work plans (2017 – 2020);</li> <li>- Government administrative data on child protection services in UNICEF programme areas (disaggregated by gender, age, type of case, outcome, etc);</li> <li>- Key informant interviews (at national, regional and local levels);</li> <li>- In-depth beneficiary interviews;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> <li>- Monitoring Reporting Mechanism Information Management System</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>9</sup> See results under CPD 2019 – 2023 Output 3.2.

		UNICEF technical and/or financial support and how did UNICEF support influence outcomes) ( <i>qualitative</i> ).			
EQ 5. To what degree have gender and equity results been achieved? [Note that this question has been added to incorporate gender and equity criteria]	EQ 5.1. To what degree has the national child protection system been able to respond to the needs of vulnerable girls and boys, especially the most marginalised, that were exposed to violence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Numbers of vulnerable girls and boys in the Philippines in need of a child protection response (e.g., at-risk of different forms of violence) disaggregated by type of child protection need, gender and equity criteria in UNICEF programme areas (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Numbers and types of child protection interventions (disaggregated by type of violence / category of need) and outcomes of interventions (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Change strategies utilised (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in services provision resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> </ul>	Key informant interviews; In-depth beneficiary interviews; Case file reviews; Service provider (SP) survey.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Descriptive analysis of quantitative data; Inferential analysis of quantitative data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National statistical data on child protection risks (child protection Baseline Research Summary Report; Rapid Assessment of Child Protection);</li> <li>- Government administrative data on child protection and child protection services;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews, particularly with social workers and other service providers;</li> <li>- In-depth interviews with children and families / caretakers</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Degree to which services provided effectively addressed underlying protection needs and resolved cases (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Changes in outcomes of child protection services resulting from UNICEF support (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>).</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>who have received a child protection response;</li> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey.</li> </ul>
<p>EQ 6. What has the level of satisfaction been among women, girls, boys and men, and communities on UNICEF's Child Protection Programme? with the quality of prevention and response services that they have received through the child protection programme? [Note that this question has been added to ensure a space for beneficiary feedback and child participation]</p>	<p>EQ 6.1 What has the level of satisfaction been among women, girls, boys and men with the quality of prevention and response services that they have received through the child protection programme?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proportion of surveyed respondents who participated in UNICEF supported interventions who would recommend these to a friend or family member (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>-Type of perceptions of services, broken down by type of service (prevention, response, etc), and the beneficiary's profile and circumstances (age, gender, background, nature of case, etc) (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Level of satisfaction with services, broken down by type of service (prevention, response, etc), and the beneficiary's profile and circumstances (age, gender,</li> </ul>	<p>In-depth beneficiary interviews; Case file reviews.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document review (existing evaluations and assessments);</li> <li>- Case file reviews;</li> <li>- Qualitative interviews with children, case workers/service providers, family members, caretakers.</li> </ul>

		background, nature of case, etc) ( <i>qualitative</i> ).			
EQ 7. Has sufficient attention been given to measuring, monitoring and reporting results including results, including those related to gender and equity? How effectively has evidence been used to inform programmatic changes and adjustments? [Note this question has been added to capture cross-cutting importance of monitoring and use of data etc.]	EQ 7.1. Has sufficient attention been given to measuring, monitoring and reporting results related to gender and equity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequency of monitoring reports / evaluations (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Number and type of recommendations implemented as part of the CP programming as a result of monitoring and evaluation processes (<i>quantitative, qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Level of participation from implementing organisations to monitoring mechanisms (by type of mechanisms) (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Level of relevance of indicators to CP programme outcome (not relevant, moderately relevant, highly relevant) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>	Document review; Key informant interviews; Monitoring data.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory; Descriptive (numeric) analysis of monitoring processes and programme reviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of documents setting out programme design, and approaches; Monitoring and evaluation frameworks and tools applied by UNICEF and partners;</li> <li>- Evaluation and monitoring reports;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, donors and project partners.</li> </ul>
	EQ 7.2. How effectively has evidence been generated and used to inform programmatic changes and adjustments and what are the enabling factors and barriers to the effective use of evidence and lessons learned to inform programmatic changes and adjustments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and type of adjustments made to programme in response to evidence (<i>quantitative and qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Degree to which these changes have been based on learning from monitoring, reporting, evaluation (changes are evidence based, changed are somewhat evidence based, changes don't reflect evidence) (<i>qualitative</i>).</li> </ul>	Document review; Key informant interviews.		
<b>Efficiency</b>					

<p>EQ 8. To what extent is the Child Protection Programming approach efficient in achieving desired results in terms of resource utilisation and timely delivery?</p>	<p>EQ 8.1. How has UNICEF mobilised and used its resources (human, technical and financial) to achieve its planned results for child protection?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific amount of financial resources (and proportion of the budget) allocated towards different components (outputs, results) of the child protection programme (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Programme budget and actual expenditure (for context) (<i>quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Number and type of funding sources that have been mobilised during implementation (by type of source and resource mobilising strategy) (<i>qualitative, quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Strategies for mobilisation employed by UNICEF (e.g. through working with donors, the private sector) (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Human resources dedicated to the programme both within UNICEF and externally (number of staff and technical capacity) (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>);</li> <li>- Alignment of human resources within UNICEF and externally to enable the key core components of the national child protection system to function</li> <li>- Capacity of human resources within UNICEF and externally to enable the key core components of the national</li> </ul>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews.</p>	<p>Resource analysis – breakdown of resources (financial, human, time, and otherwise) dedicated to different aspects of programming and sources of these.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed programme (forecast) budget, actual expenditure data (for context);</li> <li>- Document review (programme planning and strategy documents);</li> <li>- Programme materials including websites and social media platforms;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with UNICEF, development partners and implementing partners, particularly those involved in service delivery.</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---	---	--

		<p>child protection system to function</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Type of stakeholder perceptions regarding the use of resources to achieve results (<i>qualitative</i>):</li> <li>- in a timely manner;</li> <li>- in the most efficient way.</li> </ul>			
	EQ 8.2. To what extent have resources (human, technical, financial) been sufficient, both in quantity and quality?	- Nature and type of gaps in resource that impact on the effectiveness of the programme and its ability to achieve intended results (nature of gaps and their impacts) ( <i>qualitative</i> );	Document review; Key informant interviews.		
	EQ 8.3. How adequate are the capacities of UNICEF staff and implementing partners?	- Nature and type of gaps in capacity that impact on the effectiveness of the programme and its ability to achieve intended results ( <i>qualitative</i> ).	Document review; Key informant interviews.		
	EQ 8.4. To what extent have human resources been sufficient to provide the necessary technical support to national partners for the operation of the national child protection systems?	- Nature and type of gaps in resource that impact on the effectiveness of the programme and its ability to provide technical advice across all six components of the child protection system ( <i>qualitative</i> );	Document review; Key informant interviews.		

<p>EQ 9. Do more cost-effective ways of achieving the same child protection results exist? [Note additional question]</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>- Nature and type of alternative strategies which may have helped produce same results at lower costs (<i>qualitative</i>).</p>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews.</p>	<p>Resource analysis – breakdown of resources (financial, human, time, and otherwise) dedicated to different aspects of programming and sources of these.</p>	<p>- Detailed programme (forecast) budget, actual expenditure data (for context); - Programme materials including websites and social media platforms; - Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, implementing partners, government counterparts and development partners; - Qualitative interviews with implementing partners, particularly those involved in direct delivery of services /interventions.</p>
<p>EQ 10. How effectively have coordination mechanisms been working between UNICEF’s child protection programme and other UNICEF programme outcomes (across education, health, nutrition, WASH, social protection, adolescent, and communication for development) to create and sustain linkages across sectors, and between child protection actors, especially</p>	<p>EQ 10.1. How effectively have coordination mechanisms been working between UNICEF’s child protection programme and other UNICEF programme outcomes to create and sustain linkages across sectors, and between child protection actors to prevent violence against children?</p>	<p>- Time and amount of financial resources spent on coordination / creating linkages (<i>quantitative</i>); - Number and type of coordination mechanisms within UNICEF during the project to achieve intended results (per type of results); - Type of results achieved as a result of coordination with other programme outcomes and other child protection</p>	<p>Document review; Key informant interviews.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory); Resource analysis – breakdown of resources (financial, human, time, and otherwise) dedicated to different aspects of programming and sources of these.</p>	<p>- Detailed programme (forecast) budget, actual expenditure data (for context); - Document review (evaluations and reports documenting achievements resulting from joint programming).value - Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff members across sections</p>

<p>related to violence against children? [Note additional question]</p>		<p>actors (<i>quantitative and qualitative</i>); - Number and proportion of CP service providers who received referrals from health workers, police, teachers, local authorities (<i>quantitative</i>); -Level of integration of VAC messaging into education materials, etc (<i>qualitative</i>).</p>			<p>(education, health and nutrition, social protection and social policy, adolescent and youth empowerment, communication for development, and early childhood development); - Key informant interviews with key partners who have been involved in collaborative work (DSWD, MSSD, CWC, MoE, JJWC, etc); - Key informant interviews with UN agencies involved in joint programming; - Focus groups discussions in communities; - Service provider (SP) survey.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>					
<p>EQ 11. To what extent are the activities and results of the Child Protection Programme likely to continue after UNICEF support has ceased? What measures were taken so that the Government of Philippines and targeted communities could take</p>	<p>EQ 11.1 To what extent are the activities and results of the Child Protection Programme likely to continue after UNICEF support ceased?</p>	<p>- Number and type of measures integrated in programme design to promote government ownership of programming (<i>qualitative</i>); -Number of instances where government has taken (financial) responsibility for delivering services (by</p>	<p>Document review' Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.</p>	<p>Thematic analysis; Inferential analysis of survey data.</p>	<p>- Analysis of key documents setting out programme strategy and design; - Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff and partners involved in programme design;</p>

ownership of the child protection programme?		programme output areas) <i>(qualitative)</i> ; - National financial resources devoted to child protection services by Government as a result of UNICEF programming / to support continued delivery of interventions <i>(quantitative)</i> .			- Key informant interviews with government counterparts, development partners and implementing partners; - Government budgets and strategies / plans.
	EQ 11.2. To what extent are activities and results likely to be sustained through scalability and use of partnerships?	Number and type of Interventions which government, and other partners:  - Have replicated or scaled up; - Intend to replicate and scale up <i>(qualitative)</i> .	Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.		
	EQ 11.3. To what extent are activities and results likely to be sustained through changes at family and community level?	- Number and types of measures integrated in programme design to promote community ownership of programming <i>(qualitative)</i> ; - Nature of participants' perceptions about whether changes in attitudes, norms and behaviour will last going forward and explanations for why or why not <i>(qualitative)</i> ; - Number and type of changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices at family and community level that can be attributed to programme interventions <i>(quantitative)</i> .	Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.		

EQ 12. To what extent has the child protection programme contributed to the generation of capacities at national and sub-national levels? How likely are these to be used after the end of the programme? To what degree have these changes been embedded into the national and sub-national child protection systems?	EQ 12.1. To what extent has the child protection programme contributed to the generation of capacities at national and sub-national levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes in capacities of CP duty-bearers at national and sub-national levels since the beginning of the programme that have occurred as a result of programme outputs (<i>qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Proportion of duty-bearers with improved capacities that can be attributed to the CP programme (by type of capacity) (<i>quantitative and qualitative</i>);</li> <li>- Proportion of stakeholders who believe that the CP programme contributed to an increase in their capacities or the capacities of other CP stakeholders (<i>qualitative and quantitative</i>).</li> </ul>	Document review; Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.	Descriptive and inferential analysis of survey data; Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Service provider (SP) survey;</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with government counterparts at national and sub-national levels;</li> <li>- Government budgets, action plans, pre-and in-service training materials, etc.</li> </ul>
	EQ 12.2 to what extent have these capacities been embedded into the national and sub-national child protection systems?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes to the national and sub-national child protection systems since the beginning of the programme that have occurred as a result of programme outputs (qualitative);</li> <li>- changes to human resource planning to embed these changes in national and sub-national child protection systems</li> </ul>	Document review; Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.		

	EQ 12.3. How likely are these to be used after the end of the programme?	- Level of integration of capacity development initiatives (supported by the programme) into the national child protection system ( <i>qualitative</i> ).	Document review; Key informant interviews.		
EQ 13. What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability?	EQ 13.1. What are the major enabling factors that are likely to influence replication and sustainability? What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability?	- Nature and type of identified major factors that are likely to contribute to the sustainability of results in the long term and the replication and scale up of interventions ( <i>qualitative</i> ). <i>Will also emerge from explanatory analysis of effectiveness and efficiency of programme.</i>	Document review; Key informant interviews; Service provider (SP) survey.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding and grounded theory).	- Qualitative interviews with project partners and child protection duty bearers.

	EQ 13.2. What are the major constraining factors that are likely to influence replication and sustainability?	- Nature and type of major factors that are likely to hinder the sustainability of results in the long term and the replication and scale up of interventions ( <i>qualitative</i> ). <i>Will also emerge from explanatory analysis of effectiveness and efficiency of programme.</i>	Document review; Key informant interviews; Service provider survey.		
<b>Gender, equity and human rights</b>					
EQ 14. To what extent were gender, equity (including disability, geographic location, socio-economic circumstances, ethnicity etc.) and human rights principles integrated into the design, implementation and monitoring of the child protection programme? NOTE: This question is overarching / cross-cutting and we suggest that relevant findings and analysis be integrated throughout the evaluation report to avoid repetition and enrich analysis.	EQ 14.1. To what extent were gender, equity and human rights principles integrated into the design of the child protection programme?	- Nature and type of references to gender, equity and human rights principles in programme design ( <i>qualitative</i> );	Document review; Key informant interviews; In-depth beneficiary interviews; Service provider survey; Case file review.	Thematic analysis (content analysis, thematic coding, grounded theory).	- Review of documents setting out programme design, strategy and approaches; - Programme materials including websites and social media platforms; - Key informant interviews with UNICEF, government counterparts and implementing partners; - Analysis of monitoring data maintained by implementing partners / government administrative data;
	EQ 14.2. To what extent were gender, equity and human rights principles integrated into the implementation of the child protection programme?	- Examples where gender, equity and human rights considerations have informed programme implementation ( <i>qualitative</i> ); - Examples where gender, equity and human rights considerations have not informed programme implementation ( <i>qualitative</i> ).			

	EQ 14.3. To what extent were gender, equity and human rights principles (for instance to ensure the relevance of programming to the particular needs of girls, to enable their participation) integrated into the monitoring of the child protection programme?	- Degree to which programme monitoring has considered gender, equity and human rights dimensions of programming, and monitoring data is disaggregated by relevant characteristics (gender, , etc) ( <i>qualitative</i> ).			- Service provider (SP) survey.
--	---	---	--	--	---------------------------------