

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Evaluation of UNICEF Iran Adolescents Wellbeing Programme 2017-2021

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	77%	Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Evaluation of UNICEF Iran Adolescents Wellbeing Programme 2017-2021		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Iran/59/2023/19056		
<b>Region</b>	MENA		
<b>Year of report</b>	2023		
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Iran		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Iran		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	August 1, 2023		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	Yes		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	No		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Programme		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Impact		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	SDGs: 3,4,5 and 10		
<b>EQA Summary:</b> <i>The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.</i>			
<p>The report of the evaluation of the "UNICEF Iran Adolescents Wellbeing Programme 2017-2021" is satisfactory.</p> <p>The report has the following <b>strengths</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is short and easy to read,</li> <li>• It is well structured,</li> <li>• It offers a fairly comprehensive executive summary, and</li> <li>• It offers complementary annexes with additional information on the capacity building provided and the changes achieved thanks to it that allow a better understanding of the impact of the action.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the <b>weaknesses</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The part of the recommendations in the executive summary is poorly developed,</li> <li>• It contains some abbreviations that are not in the list of acronyms,</li> <li>• It does not include a conclusions section itself, and <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• It does not include a gender equality and inclusion perspective neither in its methodology nor in the analysis. <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.</i>			
<p>The report would gain quality with: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The elaboration of a shorter executive summary with stronger emphasis on the recommendations section</li> <li>•The development of a proper section on Conclusions with relevant information beyond the findings to better inform lessons learned and recommendations</li> <li>•The reconstruction of the Theory of Change or at least the elaboration of a Theory of Change that could have helped the evaluators in the analysis of stronger and future support</li> <li>•The integration of a solid gender perspective starting by providing disaggregating data regarding boys and girls accessing the services/programme activities</li> <li>•The use of less repetitive language</li> </ul>			
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	83%	Comments on Rating	
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	
		The executive summary is clear, serves as a standalone document and has useful information for decision making. It is 8 pages longer and goes deeper into the introductory part than in the part of the recommendations.	

	ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	The executive summary includes all the required information: introduction, objective of the evaluation, purpose, objectives and scope, framework and methods, findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. The ToR have no indications on the elements that needs to be included.
	iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Yes	It includes the necessary information to understand the action and does not include any different or new information compared to the report itself.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>			93%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2.</b> Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The information provided about the intervention is complete. Its objective is to provide vulnerable adolescents with knowledge and skills in protection and prevention measures that address behavioral risk factors and needs for HIV/AIDS. Location, status of implementation, timelines and budget of the Adolescent Well-being Programme (AWP) are properly described.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The section includes clear a relevant description of the rightsholders: the adolescents girls and boys and the duty bearers: the government, local authorities, local leaders, and the parents are identified and described in their roles, although the information is not disaggregated by sex, age and disability.
<b>Question 3.</b> Is the context of the intervention clearly described?				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The context and the factors that intersect with the intervention are well described.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The action was in line with global priorities, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as the support aimed at falling within the following Global Goals: SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages. SDG 4: Quality education SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. SDG 10: Reduced inequality (Page 20)
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is clear description of the needs of immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) affected and vulnerable adolescents.
<b>Question 4.</b> Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?				
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	Implementing partners, development partners, rights holders and duty bearers and the linkages between them are analysed in "Section 1.2. The context of the Adolescents Wellbeing Programme in Iran".
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	There is a clear understanding of main stakeholders and their contribution of the action in section "1.4 Key stakeholders and their contributions" , Table 1.3: Key stakeholders and their contribution
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			75%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5.</b> Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?				
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Partially	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined and is twofold: accountability and learning. However, the intended use and users are not clearly specified.
<b>Question 6.</b> Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?				
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	Yes, there is a clear and complete description. The evaluation supports (i) generation of knowledge on the successes and challenges of the Adolescents Well-Being Programme to inform future programming, and (ii) accountability for UNICEF and partners, as well as beneficiaries of the programme.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	The report clearly describes the programmatic and thematic scope of the evaluation.
<b>Question 7.</b> Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?				

	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	Although "Section 1.3 The logic of the results chain" states that No Theory of Change or Results Chain for the AWP was found in any of the availed documents, the report does provides there a clear description of the intervention's intended results in "Section 2.2.2 Scope of evaluated programme initiatives"
	ii Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	No	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is not presented either in the narrative or graphic form.
	iii For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The ToC or results framework is assessed but not reconstructed. The ToR does not require the ToC reconstruction.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions are included in "Table 3.1.: Overview over change in evaluation questions". Only evaluation questions are identified. They are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation criteria are identified and aligned with the questions in the same table.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix (annex 5) includes questions, indicators, data sources, category of participants and data collection tools and sources by evaluation criteria in which the analysis is based and the conclusions drawn.
<b>Question 9.</b>	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation design and methods (three methods used: desk reviews, semi-structured and FGDs) are clearly described in "Section: 3.2 Methods for data collection and analysis". The evaluation applies a Non-Probability Sampling Methods making use of a mix of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	Data sources (documents, interview findings from respectively involved UN agencies and implementing stakeholders) are appropriated and are both qualitative and quantitative. The evaluation used a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods for validation.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The evaluation used a mix of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. There isn't a detailed description of the sampling method in the report.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of methods of analysis. The data analysis involved an analysis of same type of experiences from different data sources and thus for an analysis of potentially different experiences with same approach or intervention. This was further held against the category of data source.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology used allows for identification of casual connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	Key limitations and mitigation measures are identified in " Table 3.3: Key limitations and mitigations".
<b>Question 10.</b>	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The evaluation adhered to United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluations. The report explicitly mentioned that reporting against gender-disaggregated indicators was not considered regarding the gender distribution of participants in capacity building activities as the programme documentation was limited and data was not gender disaggregated.

	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The methodological approach observed all ethical standards. This entails abidance by the four ethical principles: (i) Integrity; (ii) Accountability; (iii) Respect, and (iv) Beneficence. Complementary to the ethical standards for data collection, the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) were followed.
<b>Question 11.</b>	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	There is no indication of innovative practice in the methodology or analysis to improve the quality of the evaluation process.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 12.</b>	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	With the AWP having no programme documents and no progress reporting made available for UNICEF by MOHME, it was not possible to deliver an evidence-based evaluation of the full AWP (page 34). Critical data regarding the AWBCs was not shared with the team regarding the AWBCs (centers). The consultants received documentation only for a project under the AWP so the evaluation changed the focus to the performance of this capacity development project, which was essential for the performance of the larger AWP. The provided capacity development is viewed as a critical enabler for the performance of implementers in adolescence wellbeing (AWB) and thus as indirect enabler of well-being among at-risk adolescents in Iran. Questions were revised and agreed jointly by the team and UNICEF.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	No	The evaluation did not use the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings as it was not available.
<b>Question 13.</b>	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible qualitative and quantitative data from existing documents or a part of the AWP, namely for the AWP project "Empowering adolescents and youth in Iran to address their reproductive health needs," funded by the Netherlands, semi-structured interview and FGDS.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	Findings are supported by evidence for negative and positive effects, including factors that should be included for obtaining better results. Findings are based on performance indicators and means of comparison.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	Casual effects leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are identified. For instance, the reports mentioned that the exclusion of key upstream decision-makers resulted in the AWP having an inadequate knowledge about the attitude, fears and needs of these decision-makers. Thus, the programme lost an opportunity to address specific needs, attitudes, and fears which evaluation findings show, in part, affected the commitment and ability to practise full ownership and responsibility. Services for at-risk adolescent are, therefore, still inadequate.
<b>Question 14.</b>	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	The evaluation assessed the monitoring systems supporting MOHME in monitoring the AWB centers. According to the evaluators, the desk review indicated that e.g., monitoring was scarce for which reason an assessment of existence and relevance of systems was included in the evaluation.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 15.</b>	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	The conclusions are well formulated and respond to every evaluation criteria. They are forward looking and able to inform future programs.

	ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	The conclusions are properly derived from findings and show visibility about limitations and strengths of the action. The fact that they have been included at the end of each evaluation criteria in fact guarantees that they have been extracted from the findings but no insights are giving beyond the findings.
<b>Question 16.</b>		Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Partially	Information presented as lessons learned is useful but it is not a section on lessons learned. The information, presented by evaluation criteria, stems from the findings and can be used beyond this evaluation.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	Information presented as lessons learned is very useful for improving program performance but is not really lessons learned. The information is also presented by evaluation criteria.
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>			<b>75%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations respond to the purpose of the evaluation, are well formulated and derived from findings and conclusions made under each evaluation criteria.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are useful and actionable, they organized by type of actor and proposed action to implement them are gathered in "Table 6.1: Recommendation on overall/institutional changes", "Table 6.2: Recommendations on strengthening of programming practices" and "Table 6.3: Recommendations for the AWBC". They emphasize building systems and structures based on results and evidence, providing skills at all levels of actors and graduation of youth towards full employment opportunities, all align with UNSDCF priorities and therefore, with priorities of the government of Iran.
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	No	The process for developing the recommendations is not described.
<b>Question 18.</b>		Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i	Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	The recommendations are classified by group of actors, starting for the institutional level, programming level and the UN system.
<b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>			<b>93%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 19.</b>		Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages of the report include all the required information: name and location of the action, timeframe and date of the evaluation report, names of the evaluation experts, name of the commissioner: UNICEF, acknowledgements, table of contents including annexes with pages, tables and figures, acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers and a map of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
	ii	Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	The annexes include: terms of reference, list of literature, adherence to national and international priorities, focus of the work of the AWBCs, evaluation matrix, ethics approval letter, invitation and informed consent, interview templates, overview over the capacity development provided and changes achieved through capacity development.
<b>Question 20.</b>		Is the report logically structured?		
	i	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report has an understandable structure with numbered sections and titles and subtitles well formatted easy to follow.
	ii	Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The structure responds to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.
<b>Question 21.</b>		Is the report well presented?		
	i	Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The length of the report is reasonable: 55 pages. There is not reference on the number of pages in the ToR but is the number of a manageable evaluation report.

	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is almost easy to understand. It is too repetitive and some sentences are not easy to understand ( e.g., The work of the AWP and the derived recommendations emphasising on building results- and evidence-based systems and structures, providing skills across all levels of actors and the graduation of youth into opportunities for full employment, all tally with the UNSDCF priorities and thus the priorities of the government of Iran). There are some minor grammatical errors as for instance in the sentence "The recommendations here at based on a combination of evaluation findings and useful programming practices at large".
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report uses tables, graphics, maps and other visuals helping to understand the information. All are clearly presented, referenced in the text, labelled and identified in the introductory pages.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 22.</b>	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The report mentions the HRBA and the alignment with the UN human rights conventions: Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 2015, and United Nation: Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	Beneficiaries of the AWBCs have participated in the FGDs. Other stakeholders were involved as informants, mainly implementing partners and UN agencies.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Partially	Language is inclusive and avoids bias. The terminology used reinforce right holders and duty bearers respective rights and responsibilities. The information is not disaggregated by sex and age and therefore the results are not presented in a differentiated way.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Yes	The evaluation found that none of the available materials had specific targets for gender equality and social inclusion, nor disaggregated data. Thus, the AWP at large did not apply the Leaving no one behind (LNOB) principle.
<b>Question 23.</b>	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	1	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Partially integrated	Although gender equality was not considered in the available materials, the experts found "sporadic findings providing examples of gender equality and social inclusion. For example, the AWBCs responded to girls' needs by tailoring the curricula to address girls needs and behaviour and by making two centres accommodate girls".
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Not at all integrated	The methodology did not include a gender perspective.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Not at all integrated	Gender issues are not reflected in the conclusions and recommendations.

#### SWAP Rating Guidance

<p><b>i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>

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

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