

UNICEF BOTSWANA TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACT

Title of assignment:	Evaluation of MTV Shuga in Botswana
Section:	Programme (Adolescent & HIV)
Location:	Gaborone, Botswana
Duration:	7 Months
Estimated start date:	1 November 2022
Estimated end date:	31 May 2023

1. Background

National HIV estimates, and projections indicate that Botswana has the fourth highest level of HIV prevalence in the world. In 2018, the HIV prevalence among adults 15-49 years was 20.3 per cent with women having a higher prevalence than men (25% and 16% respectively). Overall, a total of 29,000 people aged 10-24 years were living with HIV of whom 64 % (18,847) were females and 36 per cent (10,644) were males. An estimated 8,510 new HIV infections occurred in 2018 being 33 per cent among young people aged 15-24 years. This accounted for 3 in every 10 new infections that occurred during that year.

Sexual abuse and violence against children have been reported to be major issues among adolescents (Botswana Youth Risk Behavioural and Biological Surveillance Survey II, 2016). In this regard, almost 19 % of sexually experienced students were forced to have sexual intercourse during 12 months prior to the survey. One-third of sexually experienced students had sexual intercourse for the first time before age 13 years, with 22 % of them reporting being forced to have sexual intercourse. The report indicates that 13.4 % of girls reported having been pregnant. Furthermore, according to the Violence Against Children’s Study, 6-9 % of young people ages 8-24 years have experienced sexual violence and 14 % experienced emotional violence. Among adolescents 13-17 years of age, 4-10 % have experienced sexual violence and 12 % have experienced emotional violence.

Comprehensive knowledge of HIV among adolescents and young people aged between 15 and 24 years is generally low, estimated at 47.9 per cent (Botswana AIDS Impact Survey, 2013). Progress in reducing new HIV infections among adolescents and young people is further constrained by intergenerational & transactional sex, peer pressure, stigma & discrimination, and gender-based violence. Barriers include entrenched harmful gender norms, gaps between policies and their implementation and inadequate resource allocation for prevention programmes. These factors call for strategic, relevant and appropriate interventions for adolescents and young people in order to reverse and mitigate the impact of HIV and AIDS.

Against this background and in alignment with the Third National Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS in Botswana, UNICEF and the National AIDS and Health Promotion Agency (NAHPA) worked together from 2018 in Partnership with MTV Staying Alive Foundation to adapt the MTV Shuga Programme as a behaviour change communication strategy to help adolescents and young people adopt safe sexual behaviour by targeting key drivers of new infections and non-adherence to ARV treatment.

The MTV Shuga Program

The MTV Shuga program is an award-winning TV program in Africa and Asia, that uses edutainment as a model to showcase challenges of young people in different contexts with the aim to provide behaviour change content to adolescents and young people. The programme extends to radio, social media and several other platforms to have a 360 degree reach of young people. In Botswana, the programme was introduced by NAHPA on the national TV in 2011 and later reintroduced on radio with the support of UNICEF in 2018 with the goal of reaching adolescents and young people with behaviour change content focusing safe sexual behaviour (delayed sex debut, prevention of transactional and intergenerational sexual relationships) and uptake of HIV services. The radio programme has so far aired 3 seasons with the support of UNICEF and extended the radio seasons to the interactive voice response (IVR) platform and face to face peer education in 4 districts with persistent HIV incidence and HIV prevalence, of Selebi Phikwe, Boteti, Ghanzi and Okavango.

Adaptation of the MTV Shuga program

The adaptations which were introduced to the MTV Shuga program through the NAHPA, UNICEF collaboration were centred on leveraging other communication channels to secure a comprehensive reach of the program i.e., utilising:

- **Radio:** The Drama series are an adaptation of MTV Shuga Down South with episodes of about 7-10 minutes, followed by in studio discussions by young people for some of the episodes so that the messages portrayed can be buttressed and to spark issues of discussion by audience. The programme airs on Radio Botswana 2 (RB2) fm and Yarona fm which are the 2 leading youth radio station and have a wider geographic coverage, especially RB2 fm. UNICEF supported production of 3 seasons of radio series since 2018.
- **Interpersonal communication:** Peer education model uses the MTV Shuga Peer Facilitation Guide which contains 7 sessions that each group of participants have to complete to be classified as being fully exposed to the MTV Shuga Peer education Programme. Pre-assessments are run by the facilitators from the beginning and post assessment done at the end of the 7 sessions for each group. This component is done by an implementing partner, Makgabaneng, with the support of both UNICEF and NAHPA as technical and funding partners.

- **Interactive voice response (IVR):** Episodes of the MTV Shuga drama series are uploaded to the interactive voice response (IVR) platform known as 124 for audience to listen to at their own time in case they missed the radio show. Also, a ‘choose-your-adventure’ game has been introduced to the platform for improved interaction with audience, the game allows young people to choose characters they like and personify the character’s decision making process and listen to how their story ends. This approach magnifies the significance of decision making by young people, elevating them to be more conscious in their decision making about key themes of the drama series.
- **Social Media:** Using MTV Shuga social media pages/ dedicated page to broaden the reach of the show, and use polls to monitor impact etc.

Program Stakeholders

UNICEF: The programme is a catalytic programme linked to UNICEF’s Country Programme Outcome 2; By 2026, adolescents and young people (10–24 years), particularly the most vulnerable, are more empowered and engaged to access quality and gender-responsive HIV, health, nutrition, education and child protection services. The program also addresses sustainable development goal 3 (SDG 3), ending HIV and AIDS epidemic by 2030. To this end, UNICEF provided initial funding for the programme including inception of Peer Education in 4 districts. Furthermore, UNICEF provides technical guidance on behaviour change strategies for the programme and coordinates all partners to ensure alignment and impact.

National AIDS and Health Promotion Agency (NAHPA)

NAHPA provide national leadership of the programme as custodian for the programme from Government side and supports engagement with districts and other government stakeholders involved in the programme. NAHPA is currently leading scale up of the programme in ten (10) other districts.

MTV Staying Alive Foundation (SAF)

The partner provides radio production services in collaboration with local production houses and develops adapted Peer education content for implementation. MTV-SAF also provide a platform for data repository, analysis and dashboard which can be accessed by partners for monitoring.

Makgabaneng

Makgabaneng is the implementing partner that manages the day to day running of the Peer Education programme, they recruit and contracts Peer Facilitators and manages their performance and programme delivery. IP also provide documentation and publicity services for the Peer education programme.

Botswana Insurance Holdings Limited (BIHL)

BIHL recently became a partner to the programme as a funder particularly for the expanding Peer Education to remote and underserved communities.

UNICEF, in support of the Government of Botswana, is seeking to contract the services of an institution to conduct the evaluation of the MTV Shuga programme in Botswana. The evaluation will be conducted through a contract with a third-party service provider which will assess the impact of the intervention package on improving adolescent and young people behaviour. A researcher and/or research organization will be recruited to carry out the evaluation. Lessons learned and products generated from the programme will be widely disseminated and government supported for any replication or scale up efforts.

2. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The main purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate how well the MTV Shuga programme achieved its outcomes. The evaluation will measure behaviour change results due to the MTV Shuga programme among adolescents and young people exposed to the interventions in 4 districts in Botswana (Selebi Phikwe, Boteti, Ghanzi and Okavango) during the time of implementation from 2020 to 2022.

An outcome evaluation will be conducted to determine how effective the MTV Shuga programme was in achieving its intended results. The evaluation will coincide with the end of UNICEF support and the start of replication of the programme by the government in several districts.

The evaluation will also consider the effect of gender and geographical location on the intended outcomes of the programme. In particular, the evaluation intends to measure whether the programme resulted in:

- a) Improved behaviour changes to adopt safe sexual behaviour
- b) Improved self-efficacy to practice safe sexual behaviour.
- c) Improved attitudes towards intergenerational and transactional sex
- d) Improved gender equitable attitudes.
- e) Increased demand for health services
- f) Improved uptake of HIV Testing
- g) And to determine the relevance and effectiveness of delivery models and communication channels utilized.

3. Evaluation Framework

The following evaluation questions and sub-questions will form the evaluation framework:

Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Sub-questions
Effectiveness	How well did the MTV Shuga programme achieve its results?	To what extent did adolescents and young people adopt safe sexual behaviours as a result of the programme? Was there an improvement in self-efficacy?
		To what extent did attitudes towards the following improve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intergenerational and transaction sex • gender norms related to prevention of HIV and unwanted pregnancy?
		What was the trend in the uptake of HIV testing amongst programme participants?
		What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of results?
Relevance	To what extent was the intervention adequate to address behaviour change among adolescents and young people?	To what extent were the beneficiaries satisfied with the behaviour change intervention?
		To what extent were the programme strategies, approaches and methods relevant and responsive to the local settings, population, circumstances and challenges?
		To what extent did the programme create linkages with similar HIV prevention and AYP empowerment programmes in Botswana, for the purposes of learning lessons, cross-fertilisation and coordination of interventions?
Sustainability	Has the programme systematically promoted national ownership, capacity-building and skills transfer to counterparts (government, civil society, AYP) in order for them to be able to sustain the programme?	<p>To what extent has the programme been able to leverage other partners', including Government resources, to contribute to sustainability of the programme?</p> <p>How well has the program been linked to and is synchronised with other programmes on reproductive health?</p> <p>To what extent have advocacy efforts been successfully used to contribute to national ownership?</p> <p>What is required to take the package of interventions to scale?</p>

<p>Efficiency</p>	<p>Do the programme results justify the investments (financial and human resources) made?</p>	<p>To what extent were the implementing strategies appropriate for achieving results?</p> <p>To what extent is the intervention/programme package feasible for scaled-up implementation?</p> <p>Which components of the intervention and its communication channels are less resource intensive but critical for the program results?</p> <p>To what extent did the intervention costings and results yield value for money</p> <p>To what extent was the package of interventions risk-informed (i.e., take into account emergency situations) and adaptable to unforeseen changes in circumstances (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic)?</p> <p>To what extent did the programme generate solid evidence from monitoring and evaluation in order to inform policy/advocacy and improved programming?</p>
<p>Gender and Equity</p>	<p>To what extent did the implementation of the intervention address child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups).</p>	<p>How well did the programme integrate gender and equity considerations into its design and implementation?</p> <p>Was sufficient information collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on gender and equity?</p> <p>To what extent was the programme disability inclusive?</p>

4. Evaluability and Methodology

Evaluation design: It is expected that the evaluation will utilise a mixed-method design that is gender sensitive and socially inclusive, incorporating quantitative and qualitative methods. To

establish the evidence, the evaluation team should assess and suggest the most appropriate design in their proposal for review.

From the evaluation questions, the evaluators will propose an evaluation matrix which will include for each question, appropriate data collection methods and tools and analyses required.

Based on UNICEF's data quality standards, all data collection and analysis will be disaggregated by key demographic characteristics (age, sex, location) and if possible, by vulnerability, including disability.

Data collection tools: Currently the intervention utilises the Pre and Post survey tool to capture indicator information before and after exposure to the various channels of delivery. For Peer Education the Peer Facilitator also use Session Tracking form which captures what and how the Peer Facilitator conducted the session, and it is completed by the Peer Facilitator after each session. Evaluators are expected to design tools or data capture instruments that will allow for collection of secondary data and possibly primary data as needed. Tools should collect both quantitative and qualitative data.

Evaluation scope: The evaluation should include all 4 targeted districts and target groups identified as part of the intervention.

Sampling approach: The evaluators will examine the proposed sampling methodology as per the existing protocol for both quantitative and qualitative data and adapt as needed and ensure representativeness and well as good participation by key stakeholders.

Flexibility of approach: UNICEF is cognizant that methodology and approach may be affected by prevailing conditions (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic) and budgetary constraints and therefore expects the successful evaluators to be flexible and creative in responding to changing situations.

A clear articulation of how the fieldwork will be undertaken and any contingency measures that will be in place to deal with COVID-19 should be detailed by the applicants. This should include alternative data collection methods if needed and safety precautions for participants and staff are accounted for. Partnership with a local research firm/institution is highly recommended.

The evaluation will be based on the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) criteria for evaluating development programmes, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability with a focus on the impact criteria.¹ Quality of the evaluation will assessed against UNICEF's Global Evaluation Report Quality Standards (see link below). At least a 'Satisfactory' rating for the draft inception as well as final reports will be expected as per definitions therein. The

¹ Further details on the UNEG criteria can be obtained from: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/22>.

evaluation team should refer to these in the development of the inception and final evaluation reports.

<https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/816/file/UNICEF-Adapted-UNEG-Evaluation-Report-Standards.pdf>

5. Primary users and intended use of the Evaluation

The primary user of the evidence generated from the evaluation will be the Government of Botswana through NAHPA as the evaluation will inform the current scale up of the programme to the other districts and sure that lessons learned are documented and built into the current programme for better implementation. UNICEF will use the evidence to continue advocacy efforts towards ensuring adolescent and young people programmes for safe sexual behaviours are developed and implemented. This evaluation will also provide adolescent and young people programming sector invaluable evidence on how to implement a social and behavioural change for adolescent and young people in Botswana that is both relevant and sustainable. Development partners and other non-governmental organisations stand to benefit from the results of the evaluation as well on the use of peer approaches to behaviour change.

6. Work Plan, Relationships and Reporting

The selected institution will work closely with UNICEF team, the National AIDS and Health Promotion Agency in the form of a Steering Committee, to conduct the evaluation and the cost analysis for the intervention package. The focal point to facilitate and coordinate this interaction will be the UNICEF Botswana Evaluation Focal Point.

The consultancy will be for the duration of 7 months over the period 1 November 2022 to 31 May 2023. The consultancy will follow the schedule in line with the expected deliverables and timelines will only be negotiated if the delay is due to conditions beyond the control of the incumbent.

A phased approach will be adopted to ensure the successful implementation of the evaluation. It is foreseen that the assignment would entail the following broad stages:

- 1) *Inception Report and Endorsement*: Develop an Inception Report that (i) articulates the theory of change; (ii) recommends an evaluation design detailing the sampling approach, data collection tools and instruments; and (iv) proposes a detailed timeline and stakeholder consultations.
- 2) *Design and Implementation of Evaluation*: Data collection, analysis, report writing and stakeholder engagement by using proposed and approved methodology to investigate the effectiveness of the MTV Shuga programme as per scope of the TOR.

- 3) *Participate in one or more validation workshops of evaluation design and evaluation findings and recommendations with the steering committee and other stakeholders*
- 4) *Produce a final evaluation report in line with UNICEF GEROS requirements*
- 5) *Evaluation advocacy brief: For dissemination of evaluation findings.*

#	Deliverables	Duration	Instalments
1.	The Inception Report (desk review, adapt methodological approach, tools development, stakeholder validation meetings, relevant ethical clearance as appropriate)	November 2022 – December 2022	20%
2.	The Evaluation Research (sampling of research tools, data collection, data analysis, presentation of preliminary results to stakeholders, draft report)	January 2023 - March 2023	50%
3.	Final evaluation report and advocacy brief	April 2023 - May 2023	30%

The draft and final evaluation report should be between 40-60 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes. The report should indicatively be structured as follows:

- a. Executive summary
- b. Introduction
- c. Description of the project, including the Theory of Change
- d. Overview of the evaluation approach, the design and methods used, including limitations and challenges
- e. Findings
- f. Conclusions and lessons
- g. Recommendations
- h. Annexes

UNICEF’s Evaluation Quality Standard and Evaluation Report Standards can be found here:

<https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/816/file/UNICEF-Adapted-UNEG-Evaluation-Report-Standards.pdf>

All reports should be submitted in electronic form and in English. As annexes to this TOR, please find all relevant **UNICEF-GEROS Quality Assessment System and Checklists** for your review and understanding of our expectations.

6. Payment Schedule

Payment will be upon satisfactory completion of deliverables as outlined in the table above. UNICEF's policy is to pay for the performance of contractual services rendered or to effect

payment upon the achievement of specific milestones described in the contract. UNICEF's policy is not to grant advance payments except in unusual situations where the potential contractor, whether an Individual consultant, private firm, NGO or a government or other entity, specifies in the bid that there are special circumstances warranting an advance payment.

Payments will be made upon delivery and approval of deliverables by UNICEF. UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if outputs are incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet deadlines.

7. Management and Oversight

The evaluation management team, comprising members from UNICEF and UNICEF ESARO will provide technical and management support. A Reference Group composed of members from the Ministry of Health and NAHPA and relevant stakeholders will provide feedback at critical stages in the evaluation process, including inception and report writing stages.

8. Qualification Requirements

UNICEF and the Government seek an institution with team members that have the following qualifications:

- Demonstrable experience in designing and conducting evaluations including cost analysis studies;
- Ability to analyse and synthesize information from a broad range of sources;
- Experience in conducting evaluating HIV and adolescents' programmes will be an added advantage;
- Familiar with adolescents' and young people's issues;
- Able to work in a multicultural environment;
- Excellent spoken and written fluency in English required; the team must also include an expert able to communicate in Setswana; knowledge of other local languages in the area desired;
- Excellent analytical, research and report writing skills;
- Effective communication and relationship-building skills
- Evaluation design: the team should consist of members with demonstrated skills and expertise required to design, plan and conduct **mixed-method evaluations**, potentially using **quasi-experimental techniques that are gender-sensitive and socially inclusive**;
- Skills in **quantitative and qualitative** data collection and analysis, drawing findings from multiple sources and handling potential contradictions between datasets.
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience: knowledge and experience required in **conducting evaluation against the OECD DAC Criteria, research about children,**

gender, equity, and child rights to ensure that the evaluation design and research methods are as relevant and meaningful as possible given the aims and objectives of the project and the context in which it is being delivered;

- Evaluation management: the team has experience managing complex evaluation (impact and process) and research process from end to end.
- Primary research: **gender-sensitive** design, management and implementation of primary quantitative and qualitative research in potentially challenging project environments, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic
- Country experience: it is particularly important that the team has the appropriate country knowledge /experience and **language proficiency** (Sesotho and English) required to conduct the research
- Team composition: a gender-balanced and culturally diverse team that makes use of national/regional evaluation expertise is an asset
- Information management: design and manage sex- and equity-disaggregated data and information systems capable of handling large datasets
- Statistical analysis: the team should have capacity for **statistical modelling and analysis** of impact data; highly proficient user of SPSS or STATA; and **qualitative data analysis** techniques, including the use of software e.g., ATLAS.ti, NVivo or equivalent where needed;
- Safety considerations: ensuring the whole evaluation process adhere to best practice for research, including the implementation of **safeguarding policy and procedures to ensure safety and protection of participants**. Note that all bidders are expected to be able to show that they have a safeguarding policy in place during the research activities.
- Experience working with/in the UN or other international development organizations in the social sector is an asset

The selected institution must provide UNICEF with a Certificate of Incorporation and other documentation that this is a registered company or institution. The institution must possess at least 5 years' experience in evaluation of programmes in health, nutrition, food security, social research with an emphasis on mixed method data collection and analysis.

The institution should come with sufficient human resources to complete the evaluation within the desired timeframe. At a minimum, the evaluation team should include expertise in the areas of social and behaviour change, adolescent and young people programming, adolescent sexual behaviour, evaluation of ICT platforms and HIV/AIDS prevention and response. Up-to-date CVs/resumes of proposed team members should be included in the submission of a technical proposal.

The lead researcher/team leader must have:

- An advanced University degree (master's or PhD) in Public Health, Epidemiology, Statistics or other relevant social science with strong experience in evaluation design;

- At least 10 years of relevant experience and proven expertise in conducting evaluations, reviews and/or assessments;
- Experience working with the United Nations, particularly UNICEF, including a strong understanding of UNICEF’s policies and programming is an asset;
- Proven skills in research analysis, including quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques;
- Excellent report writing skills, analytical skills, as well as good computer skills;
- Experience leading teams and team processes;
- Excellent command in written and spoken English.

9. Content of Proposal

The interested institutions are expected to develop the above into a proposal. All proposals should include an introductory note, summary of understanding of the terms of reference, clear outline of evaluation design and methodology with a detailed breakdown of inception phase proposed scope, data collection methodology and data analysis report writing dissemination plan and timeline including stakeholder consultation and engagement. A draft timeline for completion of assignment, a company profile and CVs of key individuals proposed for assignment should be included in the proposal. The proposal should be in two parts: Part A – Technical; Part B – Financial, of not more than 10 pages. Please note Annexes can be included.

Financial proposals should clearly outline proposed phases of the study. Each phase must be budgeted as progression to each phase will be dependent on available budget. Cost breakdown of consultancy fees, DSA operational costs for field work, air fare and related cost that will be incurred for the assignment.

10. Technical Evaluation Criteria and Relative Points

Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points Obtainable
1	Overall Response (<i>e.g. the understanding of the assignment and the alignment of the proposal to the TOR</i>)	10
1.1	Completeness of response	5
1.2	Overall concord between RFP requirements and proposal	5
2	Company and Key Personnel	30
2.1	Range and depth of Institutional experience and capacity (<i>operational partner/third party agreements, client references, previous results. Clarity on services that are to be obtained from a third party and related cost (if any).</i>)	20
2.2	Experience with projects of similar scope and complexity	5

2.3	Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed team for the assignment	5
3	Proposed Methodology and Approach (e.g., Work plan showing detail sampling methods, project implementation plan in line with the project)	30
3.1	Proposed robust plan (such as timelines, steps to set-up, criteria/methodology in management, quality assurance, monitoring tools.) Rationale/methodology is provided.	20
3.2	Technologies used: compatibility with UNICEF (Security/IT systems)	5
3.3	Innovative approach	5
	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORES	70

Note: Minimum technical required score – 50 points. Technical proposal weight is 70%, while financial proposal’s weight equals 30%.

11. Risks

Some activities may be delayed if feedback and inputs from key stakeholders are delayed. The selected institution will work closely with the Government and UNICEF Teams for the respective follow-up.

12. Terms and Conditions

The institution will use their own vehicles equipment, including computers. UNICEF will be under no operational obligation to pay operational costs related to this consultancy, all costs required to operationalise this consultancy shall be borne by the hired institutional firm and should be included into the proposed financial proposal.

13. How to Apply

- A cover letter expressing interest in the work. The cover letter should indicate relevant experience, availability and daily rate;
- Previous work samples that are relevant to this assignment;
- A technical and financial proposal as per TOR;
- Professional curriculum vitae for all team members;
- Three professional references (for the team/company);
- Company/Team profile (as applicable).

Proposals should be submitted no later 23:59hrs 28th October 2022 Botswana Time to BTW_procurement@unicef.org with a cc to ritumeleng@unicef.org

Prepared by:

Gape Machao
Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation
Officer



Date:

Reviewed by:

Tryphinah Lungah
Operations Manager



Date:

Approved by:

Alexandra Illmer
Deputy Representative



Date:

ANNEXES

ANNEX I. Inception report outline

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION*

- 1.1. Objective of the evaluation
- 1.2. Background and context
- 1.3. Scope of the evaluation

2. METHODOLOGY

- 2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions
- 2.2. Conceptual framework
- 2.3. Evaluability
- 2.4. Data collection methods
- 2.5. Analytical approaches
- 2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings

3. PROGRAMME OF WORK

- 3.1. Phases of work
- 3.2. Team composition and responsibilities
- 3.3. Management and logistic support
- 3.4. Calendar of work

ANNEXES

- I. Terms of reference of the evaluation
- II. Evaluation matrix
- III. Stakeholder map

- IV. Tentative outline of the main report
- V. Interview checklists/protocols
- VI. Theory of change / outcome model
- VII. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members
- VIII. Reference documents
- IX. Document map
- X. Project list
- XI. Project mapping
- XII. Detailed work plan

*The structure of inception reports may be adjusted depending on the scope of the evaluation.

ANNEX II. Quality Assurance Checklist of the Inception Report



UNICEF Evaluation Inception Report
Quality Review Checklist
Universalia, June 2, 2021

Individual Rating Criteria Guide	Rating	Explanation
	Yes	Criterion is addressed.
	Partially	Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect.
	No	Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect.
	Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.

RATING SCALES

Section Rating Criteria Guide	Rating	Explanation
	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%)	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports.
	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports.
	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports in some regards, but not all.
	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	Does not sufficiently meet UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports.

INCEPTION REPORT REVIEW

SECTION A: OPENING PAGES AND INTRODUCTION (weight 5%)

Question 1.	Do the opening pages and introduction of the Inception Report contain all the relevant information?
1.1	The introduction contains a short description of the purpose and content of the IR, the key activities undertaken for its preparation and its place in the evaluation process.
1.2	The introduction highlights any emerging issues that have arisen during the inception phase (if applicable).
1.3	Basic elements in the opening pages are presented (evaluation title, country, years covered by the evaluation, name(s) and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), and commissioning organization on cover page, list of acronyms, table of contents, including list of tables and figures).
Feedback on Section A - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION B. CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)

Question 2.	Are the context and description of the object of the evaluation clearly presented?
2.1	Clear and relevant description of the context of the object of the evaluation (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the object of the evaluation.
2.2	Linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.
2.3	The object of the evaluation is briefly and clearly explained (its objectives, stakeholders involved and their roles, contributions, and stakes, right holders/beneficiaries and their status and needs, time period, budget, geographic scope, phase of implementation).
2.4	The description of the object of the evaluation makes adequate references to human rights, gender, and equity/inclusion.
2.5	The logic model or the theory of change (ToC) of the object being evaluated is described to some extent, with the assumption that it will be further refined or finalized in the Evaluation Report.
Feedback on Section B - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION C: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)

Question 3.	Are the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation clearly presented?
3.1	The evaluation purpose is clearly presented, including the rationale behind the evaluation, its intended use and what this use is expected to achieve, its primary intended users and how they stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation.
3.2	The evaluation objectives are clearly presented with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the TOR.
3.3	The scope of the evaluation is clearly defined (includes: what will and will not be covered, the geographic location, period, thematic field(s) of intervention/interventions to be evaluated, levels (regional, country, municipal). Changes from ToR are clearly indicated and justified.
Feedback on Section C - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION D: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (weight 20%)	
Question 4.	Are the evaluation criteria and questions clearly presented?
4.1	All of the evaluation criteria and questions are listed as per ToR. If criteria/questions differ from ToR, the Inception Report justifies the changes, e.g. , efforts to prioritize questions and reduce number of questions to address should be noted in the report.
Question 5.	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.
5.1	The Inception Report links the evaluation criteria and questions to the chosen methodology through an evaluation matrix that includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn, referring to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Leave No one Behind (LNOB), and disability inclusion as appropriate.
5.2	Indicators, data sources, and data collection and methods are identified for each question.
5.3	The indicators chosen are specific, easily measurable, and relevant to the corresponding evaluation questions and ToC
5.4	The evaluation questions and indicators include reference to human rights, gender, and equity dimensions.
Feedback on Section D - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION E: METHODOLOGY (weight 30%)	
Question 6.	Is the methodology clearly presented, technically sound, logistically feasible, and appropriate considering the evaluation framework?
6.1	Clear and complete description of a relevant and robust methodological design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. Any adaptations to the methods proposed in the ToR are explained and justified.
6.2	If the evaluation asks attribution questions (outcome or impact level), an appropriate evaluation design (qualitative or quantitative) to reliably measure attribution is proposed.
6.3	Key data sources are clearly presented and appropriate (includes: list of documents for desk review, the group of stakeholders to be interviewed, available databases, data gaps), and appear comprehensive and reliable.
6.4	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
6.5	The sampling methods described for qualitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)).
6.6	The sampling methods described for quantitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)).
6.7	The data collection tools are linked to the specific evaluation questions (the way in which the tools are designed should facilitate capturing the information needed to answer the evaluation questions).

6.8	Questions in interview protocols, discussion guides and questionnaires are robust, focused, linked to the evaluation matrix and avoid leading questions.
6.9	The Inception Report describes relevant methodological limitations to the evaluation.
6.10	Clear and complete description of evaluation limitations, potential biases and constraints faced by the evaluation team, and mitigation strategies to be used.
6.11	The Inception Report specifies that the evaluation will follow the UNEG Norms and Standards as well as the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. weblinks: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines
6.12	Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) in accordance with UNEG ethical standards.
6.13	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (i.e. adherence to ethical principles and procedure, do no harm, confidentiality and data collection). For those cases where the evaluation will involve interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.
Feedback on Section E - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION F: EVALUATION WORKPLAN (weight 20%)

Question 7.	Is the workplan complete and containing relevant information?
7.1	The evaluation phases are clearly described, including a timeline with associated activities, number of days for each team member, locations and deliverables.
7.2	The roles and responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team are clearly described.
7.3	If the evaluation requires official ethical approval, the process to be followed is clearly described.
7.4	The Inception Report describes the evaluation quality assurance process.
7.5	The logistics of carrying out the evaluation are discussed (e.g. assistance required from UNICEF for interview arrangements, field visits, etc.) and the expected roles and responsibilities from the commissioning organization(s) or oversight committee are adequately explained.
Feedback on Section F - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	

SECTION G: INCEPTION REPORT STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Question 8.	Do the annexes contain all the relevant elements?
8.1	The evaluation ToR are included in the annexes.
8.2	The following elements are annexed to the Inception Report: logic model/ToC, evaluation matrix, bibliography, data collection tools (draft interview protocols, survey, case study formats), list(s) of people to be interviewed, if applicable and available ethical review board approval form and/or informed consent form.
Question 9.	Is the Inception Report coherent and logical?
9.1	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).
9.2	Inception Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for intended audiences and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors), and conveys key information through the use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) which are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.
	Feedback on Section G - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

ANNEX III. UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report standard

The title page and opening pages provide key basic information

1. Name of the evaluation object
2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report
3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object
4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators
5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes
7. List of acronyms

Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:

1. Overview of the evaluation object
2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience
3. Evaluation methodology
4. Most important findings and conclusions
5. Main recommendations

Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:

1. ToRs
2. List of persons interviewed and sites visited
3. List of documents consulted
4. More details on methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity
5. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition
6. Evaluation matrix
7. Results framework

Object of Evaluation

The report presents a clear and full description of the ‘object’ of the evaluation

1. The **logical model and/or the expected results chain** (inputs, outputs, and outcomes) of the object is clearly described

2. The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government’s strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency’s corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.

Scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:

3. **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly or indirectly

- **The geographic context and boundaries** (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant).

- **The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object**

- The **total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget (s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner).

4. The **key stakeholders involved** in the object implementation, including the implementing agency (s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles

5. The report identifies **the implementation status of the object**, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation

Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope

The evaluation’s purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained

1. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used by different intended audiences.

2. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover

3. The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators

4 As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights

Evaluation Methodology

The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

1. The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.
2. The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.
3. The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample
4. The evaluation report gives me complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities of consultation
5. The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.
6. The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.
7. The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools etc.)
8. The evaluation design was ethical and included ethical safeguards where appropriate, including protection of confidentiality, dignity, rights and welfare of human subjects particularly children, and respect of the values of the beneficiary community.

5. Findings

Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report

1. Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data
2. Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope

3. Findings are objectively reported on the evidence
4. Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed
5. Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible
6. Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence

6. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Conclusions present reasonable judgements based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation

1. The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgements relating to key evaluation questions
2. Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings
3. Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users
4. Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented in taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders
5. Lessons learned, when presented, were generalized beyond the immediate intervention being evaluated to indicate what wider relevance there might be.

7. Recommendations

Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders

1. The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendation including consultation with stakeholders
2. Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions
3. Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation

ANNEX IV. UNICEF Quality Assurance Checklist for the Evaluation Report



UNICEF Evaluation Report
Quality Review Checklist
 Universalis, June 2, 2021

RATING SCALES

	Rating	Explanation
Individual Rating Criteria Guide	Yes	Criterion is addressed.
	Partially	Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect.
	No	Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect.
	Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.

RATING SCALES

	Rating	Explanation
Section Rating Criteria Guide	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%)	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence.
	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence.
	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	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%)	Does not sufficiently meet the UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports; and thus decision makers cannot rely on the evaluation.

DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT REVIEW

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?
1.1	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.
1.2	Clear and relevant description of intended rights holders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the object of the evaluation) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighborhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . .(as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?
2.1	Clear and relevant description of the context of the object of the evaluation (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the object of the evaluation.
2.2	Linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.
2.3	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the right holders/beneficiaries of the intervention.
Question 3.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?
3.1	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).
3.2	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.
	Feedback on Section A - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

Question 4.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?
4.1	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and what this use is expected to achieve.
4.2	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation.
Question 5.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?
5.1	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 and/or in the inception report.
5.2	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToR and/or inception report, 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).
Question 6.	Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?
6.1	Clear and complete 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.
6.2	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).
6.3	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.
	Feedback on Section B - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)

<p>Question 7.</p>	<p>Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</p>
<p>7.1</p>	<p>Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation and are aligned with the evaluation criteria.</p>
<p>7.2</p>	<p>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.</p>

Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?
8.1	Clear and complete description of a relevant and robust methodological design and set of data collection methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope.
8.2	Data sources are appropriate, normally including qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR), and are all clearly described.
8.3	Sampling strategy is provided, describing how diverse perspectives were captured (or if not, providing reasons for this).
8.4	Clear and complete description of data analysis methods.
8.5	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
8.6	Clear and complete description of evaluation limitations, biases and constraints faced by the evaluation team and mitigation strategies used.
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation and to 2015 UNICEF Procedure on Ethics to conduct Research, Studies, Evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:
9.1	Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) in accordance with UNEG ethical standards.
9.2	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (i.e. adherence to ethical principles and procedure, do no harm, confidentiality and data collection). For those cases where the evaluation involved interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.
9.3	If the Evaluation Report required an official ethical approval and informed consent, both forms are included as an annex in the draft final evaluation report.
	Feedback on Section C - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)

Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?
10.1	Findings contain sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's criteria and questions. Gaps in evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias are highlighted if relevant.
10.2	If feasible and relevant to the purpose, cost analysis is clearly presented (how costs compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected results)-if not feasible, an explanation is provided.
10.3	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.
11.1	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data, presenting both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.
11.2	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.
11.3	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analyzed.
11.4	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyze the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?
12.1	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.
	Feedback on Section D - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)

Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?
13.1	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).
13.2	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.
Question 14.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]
14.1	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.
14.2	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.
	Feedback on Section E - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?
15.1	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.
15.2	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.
15.3	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).
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?
16.1	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.
	Feedback on Section F - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?
17.1	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the object evaluated, date of report, location of evaluated object, name(s) 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.
17.2	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).
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?
18.1	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).
18.2	Structure follows UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose, objectives and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
18.3	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
18.4	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.
18.5	Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.
	Feedback on Section G - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	
Question 19.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?
19.1	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.
19.2	Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation, including in the development of recommendations, (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)
19.3	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed equity?
20.1	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, i.e. it is aligned with the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy as appropriate.
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?
Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	
21.1	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.
21.2	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.
21.3	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?
22.1	An executive summary is included that is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users. (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).
22.2	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the object of the evaluation, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, and key recommendations) as per ToR.
22.3	Includes all significant information to understand the object of the evaluation and the evaluation itself AND does not introduce new from what is presented in the rest of the
	Feedback on Section I - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.