

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Formative Evaluation of the Implementation of the Ministry of Public Health and UNICEF Pilot Child Protection Joint Initiatives (Thailand) 2018-2022

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	80%	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			
Title of the evaluation report	Formative Evaluation of the Implementation of the Ministry of Public Health and UNICEF Pilot		
Report sequence number	Thailand/60/2023/19315		
Region	EAPR		
Year of report	2023		
Office	Thailand Country Office		
Coverage (countries)	Thailand Country Office		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	23/6/2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	Externally managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	No		
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)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Pilot/innovation		
Evaluation type	Formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	16.2		
EQA Summary: <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>This formative evaluation of a pilot intervention in Thailand was a complex undertaking in that the three components of the intervention with different types of child protection services were separately evaluated as well as how well they performed as per their combined Theory of Change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The report effectively covers the object and the context with a few recommendations from this review for improvement. •The evaluation purpose and objectives are very clear and the scope well defined. •A good practice and possibly innovative is the construction of theories of change expost facto first by component and then an overall TOC that was collaboratively agreed by UNICEF and the MoPH. •The graphics are well done and contribute significantly, although Figure 1 is still hard to read •The evaluation design and methodology is strong in nearly all aspects. •The findings section is well developed with references to the questions and the TOC and presents a summary of the main findings (called preliminary conclusions) by criterion. •Gender and inclusion have been well considered in the questions and the findings with some strengthening as noted below. <p>The report is satisfactory, however, in terms of its usefulness particularly at higher levels of management, the wording of the conclusions, recommendations and lessons require a general re-working to follow the hierarchy of analysis from findings to conclusions which launch the recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The lessons would be more effectively phrased as points for learning rather than recommendations, as some are. This pertains both to the text (Sections 8, 9, 10 and 11) and to the executive summary where the wording needs to deliver the clout to gain management attention, especially regarding the weaknesses in the design of the joint UNICEF MoPH interventions. •In regard to duty bearers the description of the bigger picture including the stakeholders who work on similar and related child protection issues including sexual abuse, the most prevalent form of violence, is missing or hard to find among the annexes. •In regard to rights holders, the grouping of children throughout the report does not always serve to identify the differences among them by gender and ages, such as adolescents particularly girls who may be subject to prostitution or early marriage. •Annex C is found in a separate document without a summary of its contents available in the main report. •Further, the ethical issues are well covered but scattered among the text and annexes. •The SDGs are not mentioned. 			
Recommendations for Improvement: <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>			

The recommendations by order of priority are as follows.

- Rework the wording and order of sentences in the conclusion and recommendation sections (Sections 10 and 11) limiting the factual or background sentences that are not specifically derived from findings. The "final" conclusions should represent a higher level of analysis and be the basis for the recommendations. Suggest that "preliminary conclusions" be changed to summary of key findings or similar and the word final is not used for the conclusions which should be final at this stage. Rework some of the lessons (Section 9) to be in lesson language and if possible add more lessons as the evaluation produced quite a number of them. Refer to UNICEF, UNEG and other online sources for development of lessons, conclusions and recommendations.
- Revise the executive summary accordingly.
- Add introductory paragraphs to the conclusions section (suggest to repeat the evaluation objectives) and the recommendations section (add the process used to develop the recommendations).
- Expand the descriptions of the duty bearers and rights holders that are mainly in the Context (Section 1) and the Object (Section 2) sections.
- Add the table of contents to the Annex C which is currently blank. Some parts like the team member descriptions and the workplan should be separate annexes.
- Make the report easier to navigate by gathering the needed contents into the same annexes or referencing the annexes, such as the ethical guidance and the interactions with the evaluation reference group.

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The Executive summary (ES) can be useful as a stand alone document for decision making and covers 4 pages. The findings and conclusions are lumped into one section making the transition from findings to conclusions somewhat difficult to trace. While this is a way to be succinct, suggest to put in at least one finding sentence in the paragraphs to reveal more about what the evaluation discovered through the data analysis. What is more highly recommended is to separate the conclusions from the findings with recommendations clearly launched from the conclusions. There is one additional page available in the recommended length. Some of the bolded statements lack the clout needed to gain attention of the top management. The conclusions and recommendation sections of this review offer suggestions to strengthen them, such as using evaluative language and making sure the findings through to conclusions, through to recommendations hierarchy of analysis is clear. The lessons are also more effective if expressed in lesson form rather than in recommendation form.
ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Partially	The summary includes an overview of the intervention, purpose, objectives and intended audiences, lessons and recommendations. The methodology should include mention of consultation with the evaluation reference group. Suggest that gender issues such as disaggregation of data are more fully covered in the ES speaking to the UNICEF focus on GEEW and in recognition of the vulnerability of women in Thailand. The first lesson as found in the summary is slightly different from the lesson in the text and suggest that the bolded lesson regarding the results based management para 79 is the most important for the exec level.
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	The summary contains significant information for understanding of the intervention and the evaluation and new information is not introduced.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	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	Section 2 describes the Object of the Evaluation Intervention and Table 1 effectively sets out the location, budget, timeline (2018-2022), objectives and expected beneficiaries, partners, and components (note: the meaning of the word axes in the first column is not clear). The details are further explained in the text. (It is noted that programme docs are not available!)
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/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The object is primarily a capacity building intervention and focuses on the information systems and technology and training or other capacity development activities in three different components that support child rights. A brief description of the duty bearers and rights holders as organizations or persons appear in one sentence at the end of Section 2.1. The numbers reached appear in the Table 1 with a statement that the expected (future) beneficiaries are not disaggregated as to gender or disability. The numbers reached in the pilot area are unclear in the description but appear later in the findings. Some description is provided of local health personnel and parents. Further description of the stakeholders is found in Annex O. The government duty bearers are not fully described and would be expected to include the local officials and presumably other ministries relevant and their local counterparts connected to protection of children and women's rights and human rights? Further explanation of the intervention location (all seven provinces of Health Region 8) is found in Section 2.3. Suggest that the report give more emphasis to the intended rights holders, their gender and ages and the differences among them. Sufficient attention is devoted to children with disabilities and weakness in including them. The duty bearers can be expanded through discussion of the extended range of assistance actors who are working on similar interventions.

Question 3.	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 intervention context is effectively covered. Section 1 describes the context of the intervention including the global child protection context, the policy and in 1.1 including the relevant global and country level UN strategies, Thailand's socio economic context, and the ICT situation including digital services and data management. Section 1.5 focuses on the situation of children exposed to violence and abuse in Thailand. Section 3 describes the intervention area. Annex D covers the child protection system both globally and in Thailand. The principles for digital development are also discussed in Table 15 and other principles underlying the interventions. It is necessary to refer to Annex N which offers more of the context. A light suggestion is to put these two annexes closer together.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	Targets and indicators for the pilot are incorporated. The SDGs are not mentioned in the entire report, although other national and regional targets are included. In terms of SDG 16.2, it speaks of ending abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children. Please mention SDG 16.2 and note how it relates to the area being evaluated. Other SDGs may also be relevant.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	Section N5 of Annex N discusses in more detail of the situation of children exposed to violence and abuse in Thailand. Some of the context for sexual abuse is missing such as the sex trade and the children who are vulnerable to being abused in this way. Since sexual abuse is the most prevalent, the perpetrators seem to be left out of the discussion and whether and how other actors are working to address the people who perpetrate sexual abuse. Suggest to make it clear what types of abuse are being discussed aside from the internet, and who are the perpetrators and what protection actions balance the joint intervention on the palliative side. Also children as a group are lumped together and adolescent problems may often be very different from those of younger children. Suggest to clarify the statuses of older girls who are still classified as children and how they may be protected by the evaluation object or actions by other stakeholders, such as from early marriage or forcing into prostitution.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	The report identifies the implementing agencies as well as rights holders and duty bearers. A stakeholder map is not found in this report or in the inception report. As per the TOR - "Key stakeholders to be involved in the data collection should be selected from UNICEF, critical national government agencies, policymakers, implementing partners, CSOs, NGOs, and beneficiaries." The TOR does not request a stakeholder list but several questions require contact with key stakeholders, therefore they need to be clearly identified as part of the formative approach. Which other UN and other organizations are working toward similar goals?
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Table 2 in section 3.2 shows the users and intended usages by them. Some duty-bearers external to the primary duty-bearers are mentioned, however, their roles are not well described such as the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, as well as the Ministries of Justice and the Interior. Some stakeholders are missing which would generally be important to a child protection intervention, such national institutions covering gender and human rights, other UN organizations, particularly UNFPA for reproductive sex and rights, and NGOs concerned with child protection and sex trafficking and related concerns. Their roles in relation to the intervention or complementing it are important to note and highlight the synergies and connections. Other organizations aside from MoPH are not mentioned on the Annex M of persons interviewed. While it may be too late to include them in interviews their roles should be acknowledged. The list of persons on the Evaluation Reference Group should be included as being consulted.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.	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.	Yes	Section 3 covers the purpose of the evaluation. The dual purposes of accountability and learning are mentioned in order for UNICEF to scale up the joint initiatives with the Ministry of Health to national level. Lessons and good practices from the pilot are intended to promote learning for the partners.
Question 6.	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	Section 4 mentions three specific objectives which in addition to assessing the progress as per evaluation criteria, also seeks to engage with the MoPH team to provide actionable recommendations. Figure 4 effectively sets out a graphic to show the inter-relationship among the objectives with gender equity, social inclusion and child rights as foundations. This depiction (with a clearer image replacing the blurry one) is noted as a good practice to promote visualization of the evaluation objectives with the cross cutting issues.
	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 scope is very well defined in Section 5. The scope is broken down into thematic, geographical and chronological as per the TOR. As such, Table 3 presents demographic data of the target provinces and Table 4 in section 5.3, defines the chronological scope of each implementation component. Section 4 notes that a cost benefit analysis proposed in the TOR by agreement with the evaluation management will instead become a "soft" analysis of efficiency for the purposes of this evaluation with a more rigorous exercise in the future.
Question 7.	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	Section 2.2 discusses the Theory of Change, which was built upon the Workflow diagram shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 depicts the ToC which is accompanied by a narrative.
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	Figure 2 graphically depicts the CP Joint Initiatives ToC, followed by a text that describes the hypotheses including inputs, outputs and outcomes both long and short term.
	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 was constructed by the evaluation team in coordination with the UNICEF Country Office by linking the three main components of the pilot. In a consultative process the MoPH and the capacity development partners agreed on the inputs, outputs and outcomes. The process of development of the ToC was thus a result of a series of stakeholder consultations. Annex E thoroughly explains this process and shows how the documentation was the basis of a revised results chain(expost facto) for each of the components and each includes outputs and activities. This is a very thorough analysis and is noted as a good practice for post facto breakdown and rebuilding of a cohesive results chain.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		86%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.	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	Section 6 presents the evaluation criteria and questions. Five of the six main OECD-DAC criteria were used and the TOR noted that it was too early to assess impact so it was not included. Section 6.2 sets out the evaluation questions and Table 5 shows the key questions as aligned with the relevant criteria.
	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 is found in Annex F. The matrix is comprehensive and describes the evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators, methods of data collection, data sources, and approach to data analysis.
Question 9.	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	Section 7 covers the methodology and mixed methods approach. The literature and data reviews are complemented by key informant and small group interviews in two sampled provinces, a limited sample due to the pilot nature of the intervention, and includes direct observation of the management information systems (MISs) and services. A targeting operating model approach is used to look closely at the hardware and software and related staffing and processes. A multi-disciplinary approach is briefly described.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources are appropriate and include qualitative and quantitative sources. A more complete description is provided in Annex O where details are provided including information regarding the inception period and the data collection process. Annex O Table 19 describes the data collection instruments.

	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Annex O includes the sampling strategy although it is not labeled as such and Table 18 shows the indicative number of KIs and FGDs. Annex K sets out the type of data collection instrument and its questions with the numbers of respondents which indicated how the diverse perspectives were captured. Suggest to label Annex O as the sampling strategy.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	Data analysis is very briefly discussed in section 7.4 and again described in Annex O (O.4) with the primary tool being coding used for triangulation of primary data. The triangulation of qualitative primary data with secondary data is not emphasized. The research guide mentioned as being in Annex C is not found in the report but it is noted that it is in a separate file. The reason for this is unclear and there is no summary found of what is in the research guide except a note that confidentiality is respected. Section O.1.1 can mention triangulation of the sources of data. Although this was surely done, it is not assertively mentioned which is important. Suggest to reveal the mystery which is what is in Annex C by including a brief note in the text and inserting the table of contents of the research protocol in the Annex C.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The methodology including the multi-method approach promotes the analysis of outputs and expected outcomes which is carried out in the finding section, but this is not totally clear in the discussion of the methodology. Suggest to add text to describe how the causal connections will be investigated.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	Limitations and constraints are described in section 7.6 and detailed on Table 7. The mitigation strategies are well described and gaps in the evidence are noted as due to time lapse between the intervention and the evaluation, some beneficiaries had relocated and memory was taxed for others. The mitigation measures are feasible.
Question 10.		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	Section 7.5 briefly mentions the ethical considerations and the Annex C research guide is mentioned (which is blank). Ethical approval of research protocols is presented in Annex L. The reference to the UNEG obligations and principles is more detailed in Annex O in O.5. The Research Guide Annex C which is in a separate report and is unlikely to be read by most Stakeholders includes more detail in section 3 and suggest this is brought into the body of the text or a summary of it.
	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.	Partially	The UNICEF research ethics approval is granted to the evaluation group at Oxford Policy Management in Annex L. Suggest to bring in to the main text more of the sentences found in Annex C on how the ethical safeguards will be applied and that children will not be interviewed.
Question 11.		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Yes	Some aspects of the evaluation process while being good practice may be considered innovative in depth and complexity. This includes the development of the intervention Theory of Change building upon the three component ToCs and recreating the overall theory with UNICEF and the MoPH as described in Annex E.
SECTION E:		EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.		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	Section 8 sets out the findings and preliminary conclusions. The preliminary conclusions are matched with the findings paragraphs which is helpful to confirm that the questions are answered. The paragraphs are also numbered to facilitate references to the text. There is a fair amount of background information in the findings which can be limited.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The findings section does a good job of referencing the results framework and Theory of Change or lack thereof and the weakening of the intervention approach by lack of a clear causal pathway in the design phase. Gender equity and human rights are effectively woven in.

Question 13.	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 qualitative and quantitative data collected by the evaluation team is used and presents both output and outcome-level data on Table 8. While triangulation is generally used, data from single sources are sometimes used but noted as single source.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	The findings are supported by evidence and both negative and positive are discussed. The findings demonstrate the weaknesses in implementation design partially due to lack of a clear set of performance indicators which had to be expost facto developed. This in addition to the complexity of the three component pilot are handled well in the findings section although there seems to be a great deal of information that would ordinarily be thought of as background regarding systems functioning but discovered in the data collection.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The range of causal factors are effectively discussed and the progression from implementation to results is also well analyzed. The report extensively covers the three components in themselves and in relation to the joint pilot management, making the findings very useful.
Question 14.	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 assesses against the ToC that was jointly constructed ex post facto as described in Annex E and the rebuilding of a cohesive results chain. The weak monitoring of the intervention by UNICEF and the MoPH of the pilot interventions is noted in several sections of the findings and led to recommendations and lessons learned.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	50%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Partially	The final conclusions are presented in section 10. (Suggest these are just called conclusions as what is in the report should be seen as final, rather than tentative or preliminary, suggest that preliminary conclusions be called summary of findings or conclusive statements on the answers to evaluation questions.) The wording of the conclusions is very important as that is what most readers will focus on as launching points for the recommendations. Relevance para 83 is a statement of fact rather than a conclusion. The substantiation of the intervention is not needed here unless there is evaluative language used and it is a result of the data collection analysis. For example: "The design of the intervention is appropriate to the context". Paragraph 85 is speaking to the evaluation team effort which might be misconstrued that the finding is a fault of the team! The conclusion should be directed to the joint management such as "the design of the intervention was not anchored in ... making the causal pathway unclear for the duration of the intervention". Para 86 is predicting the future, rather, "Systematic monitoring was not carried out to ensure...and continuously steer the intervention increasing its relevance." Some of para 86 would be part of the recommendation. For para 88 suggest to reverse the sentences to make the first the conclusion. Para 89 is again a statement of fact, make it conclusive on which to launch a recommendation. "The lack of a conclusive national strategy to classify violence against children....." Coherence para 91, reverse the sentences and make the second the bold conclusion. Para 93 "Child Shield is not fully sensitive to the predictive variablesresulting in likely underestimation of the numbers of children at risk - with effect on the program design". Para 94, what is important is whether the numbers reached approximated the target or were under or over achieved.
	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	Conclusions are derived from the findings and both strengths and limitations are covered. Some statements are not strongly conclusive enough to represent a higher level of insight which grabs management attention and draws the focus as to how the limitations will be addressed in the recommendations. The conclusive statement found in bold should be strong and persuasive and using evaluative language (e.g., relevant, appropriate, coherent, coordinated, effective, efficient)
Question 16.	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	Section 9 discusses lessons learned and the lessons are very useful. Some of the bolded statements are more of a recommendations whereas phrasing that indicates the lesson is more powerful, such as for para 79: "When UNICEF does not adhere to its own guidance on the use of results based management the investment in interventions may not pay off in terms of the desired outputs and outcomes." Para 81 - "To facilitate a seamless transition between the data and the services provided.....an assessment of the potential..is vital to the intervention success .."
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons (only four) are mainly clear whereas para 79 has too much basic factual detail. Para 81 on the other hand could use a few more sentences to explain to global viewers when the assessment should ideally take place as a prelude to the design and how its results can be used as illustrated in this pilot experience. This evaluation has produced many lessons and more could be added, such as guarding whether national organizations are prepared and whether national strategies contain the supporting policies needed for success of the idea propelling the pilot effort, or that the pilot may inspire changes in policy and strategy as an upward capacity development.
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)			63%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partially	Section 11 presents the prioritized recommendations. They are well set out in two Tables, for strategic (Table 12) and operational (Table 13). They are well aligned with the evaluation purpose and mention the reference numbers of the conclusive statements in the criteria sections. This is useful as evidence that that the questions have been addressed, but the conclusions in the conclusion section are what should be referenced as they should represent the higher level analysis. Suggest to add the conclusions by number.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	The recommendations can be useful and actionable to the users. The targeted recipients (users) are found in one column with priority status in another which is well organized. The recs are not always formulated with strong recommendation statements and some are buried in a discussion of background and unneeded detail and the specific actionable steps are not clear. It is useful to have the key recommendation statement bolded to highlight it followed by advice for implementing the recs. The recommendations should be numbered for easy reference. It is suggested to sub-number or bullet the actionable steps. The second strategic recommendation starts with a justification statement. Suggest to make this into a strong recommendation, such as: "UNICEF should take advantage of the opportunity to mediate the relationship between and work toward a plan for seamless cooperation.". There is no need for "complex and challenging" which does not add to the clout of the recommendation. A first actionable step is suggested and there should be other steps suggested to be more useful to the users. Recommendation 3 is convoluted with factual statement and detail. Suggest for the second sentence as an actionable step: "Continue to use the services of the U of Oxford which is self funded....."
	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).	Partially	The process for developing the recommendations, based on the rigorous data analysis, is assumed to be from the data collection methods such as evaluation reference group, key informant and focus group discussions with triangulation with secondary sources but this is not implicit in the text. Please add to the introduction paragraph how the recommendations have been developed and mentioning the duty bearers and rights holder or explaining why they were or may not have been fully involved.
Question 18.		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	There is clear identification of the groups or duty bearers who are the main parties responsible for carrying out the recommendations. They are identified in one column with the priority status of the recommendation in another which is well organized.
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)			64%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.		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 do include the relevant information and the Table of Contents is complete with annexes, tables, figures and boxes.

	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Partially	The annexes include the TOR (A), document review (B), the evaluation matrix (F), list of interviewees (M), the TOC and results chain (E), data collection instruments (G,H,I,J and K). The research guide (C) is blank and a separate document which contains additional methodology, the list of site visits and information about the evaluators. Additional annexes include more information on the context (N), and methodology which contains more on the ethics. Suggest that vital information is brought into the body of the report or more clearly identified as separate annexes. This includes Ethical considerations and information about the evaluators. Otherwise this information is hard to find in the report. The inception report contains the workplan and team composition but since the inception report is not attached to this report, these should be noted preferably as separate annexes or reference made in the text so they can be located.
Question 20.	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).	Partially	The structure contains numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles. The sections are well formatted. The report is sometimes a challenge to navigate. A light suggestion is to reorder the annexes to match the order of the text such that context and methodology details are earlier annexes and adding annexes for workplan and team composition as well as ethical considerations unless the text is modified to contain these. Hyperlinking the annexes in the text would also help readers to find the information they are looking for more expeditiously.
	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 adheres to the UNICEF guidelines.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Partially	The TOR suggests up to 40 pages for the report body and 5 for the executive summary. The main text currently has 50 pages. While this may be due to need to cover the three components, the text could be reviewed to omit detail not critical to understanding the main points. Some graphics may go into the annexes. The length should be agreed with the joint partners and justification for alterations on TOR advice given.
	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 generally well written and free from errors. It is a bit wordy in some places and can be trimmed to take out extraneous language.
	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.	Partially	There is frequent use of visual aids which contribute greatly to the discussion and they are well labeled. Please review the tables and figures to ensure they are clear. Figure 1, it is hard to read the explanations, and could be bolded for better readability or the text repeated in the narrative from below. Figures 3, 4 and 5 have been improved in the second version.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	88%	Comments on Rating
Question 22.	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	Annex N supplements the context discussion in the text and discusses the policy and legislative context for child protection in Thailand, including the CRC, and CRPD and rights of migrants, as well as the country's membership in ASEAN and Commission for promotion and protection of the rights of women and children.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	Stakeholders are involved as informants. The TOR notes that a reference group should be set up. Clear discussion on an ERG is difficult to find in the final report. There is reference to a meeting in Annex M. Annex O mentions engagement with an ERG during the inception period. Since the ERG is an important safeguard against evaluation team bias and indicative of the transparency of the process, the reference group and the interactions with it should be in the body of the text under methodology, briefly described and some words to that effect in the executive summary methodology section. The persons on the ERG may be listed as informants.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	Language is empowering and inclusive and terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is used effectively. The report mentions various groups in the context and findings.

	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 focuses on the functioning of the management information system and IT and capacity development which are all aimed to address child rights. The evaluation has included gender related aspects and disability in the data collection. The (One Stop Crisis centers) OSCCs and their effectiveness is well explored and they take account of the intersection of violence against women and children. The lack of inclusion of disability in the implementation is noted by the team in the findings and the conclusive statements and recommendations. The weak recognition of the partners of the need to factor in those who may not be included is also mentioned.
Question 23.		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	8	
	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.	Satisfactorily integrated	Gender equality is integrated into the evaluation criteria. GEEW is well integrated into the questions in the relevance and efficiency criteria in terms of gender equality and social inclusion as they relate to child protection. GEEW related data was collected, mainly qualitative and the gender and inclusion dimensions are generally covered under each criterion. It is noted in Section 2 on the object that children are lumped together and not disaggregated by gender or disability. The components are examined in relation to the capacity to generate disaggregated data under Efficiency in expansion of the pilot. It is unclear why the pilot did not generate the disaggregated data and seems to be related to the development of the data collection systems. This would be especially important given the relative vulnerability of females.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The evaluation used mixed methods and a range of data sources are used. Data collected was disaggregated as to sex where possible. The ethical principles were well observed and an ethics approval was obtained.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation context covers social groups, including vulnerable groups. The findings answer the gender related questions and the report provides gender related conclusions and recommendations. No unanticipated effects are specifically pointed out.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>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.</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>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>