

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Summative Evaluation of the Urban Sanitation Project (USP) in Ghana (2015-2022)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		83%	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	Summative Evaluation of the Urban Sanitation Project (USP) in Ghana (2015-2022)		
Report sequence number	Ghana 61-2023-19318		
Region	WCAR		
Year of report	2023		
Office	Ghana		
Coverage (countries)	Ghana		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	19/02/2024		
Name of review firm	IOD-PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
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	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Project		
Evaluation type	Summative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Non-experimental		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	6		
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>			
This report is very well written, well organized, and thorough and is rated highly in many aspects. The report strengths are as follows.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is an executive summary which represents the contents of the report and can stand alone with some modifications. •The context of the Urban Sanitation Project (USP) is very well described covering the socio-economic situation and national strategy for WASH, institutional set up for WASH, and SDG 6. •The object to be evaluated is clear and relevant and the report includes all needed aspects. •The stakeholders and users are presented on matrices and include all relevant duty bearers and rights holders as well as their roles and contributions. •The purposes and objectives of the evaluation are well defined. •The Theory of Change has been constructed by the evaluation team and the assumptions are listed. •The evaluation design and set of methods are appropriate, assess both qualitative and quantitative data and allow for drawing out the causal connections. •The sampling strategy is well defined and the methods of analysis effectively described. •Compliance with ethical standards and how they are applied are well described. •The findings are clearly structured by criterion alongside the pillars of the project. •Credible forms of data are presented as evidence for both positive and negative findings. •The monitoring system of the project is assessed. •The recommendations are useful and prioritized, and the responsible duty bearers identified by recommendation. •The report is structured to include all the required components and is well formatted and hyperlinked to the Table of Contents. •It is free of jargon and well written and includes tables, boxes, figures and photographs which contribute significantly to the object and findings. •Gender, Human Rights and Equity (GHRE) is a thread running through the entire report and part of the approach and data collection and analysis. 			
The top line issues are as follows.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Of primary concern is that the evaluation matrix (Annex 3) is not for the project being assessed and did not allow this critical component to be assessed by GEROS. •Linkages between the conclusions and recommendations are weak at times (Section 8). This issue also affects the executive summary. •While the institutional situation regarding WASH in Ghana is well described (Section 1.2), there is little discussion on the users of the WASH systems, including which groups and individuals are most vulnerable to effects of inadequate WASH and the health and development issues they face. •The Theory of Change as reconstructed is not brought in specifically to the findings. 			
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>			

Topline recommendations are as follows.

- Drop in the appropriate evaluation matrix (Annex 3 or recommended a new annex designated for the matrix) for the project being evaluated.
- Strengthen linkages between the conclusions and recommendations (Section 8) by ensuring that the conclusions are expressed at a high level of analysis and launch the recommendations.
- Revise the executive summary indicating clear connections between the findings, conclusions and recommendations to inform decision makers.
- Include a broader and deeper discussion of the users of the WASH systems in the context (Section 1.2), including which groups and individuals are most vulnerable to effects of inadequate WASH and the health and development issues they face. Include indicators of health and development relevant to the goal of the project to support the development of children.
- Review the findings (Section 7) and bring in the Theory of Change noting where the constructed version is valid, whether the assumptions hold, and where it can be strengthened for future projects.
- Bring in the Evaluation Reference Group in the methodology (Section 6) as a means to mitigate bias and as reviewers of the deliverables. Mention them by name in an interview list in the annexes.
- Agree with the evaluation management the length of the report given the complex technical details and relegate some of the tables and figures to the annexes if necessary.

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		83%	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 is clearly presented and may serve as a standalone with some modifications. The summary meets the page limits. The findings are presented very clearly. Suggest to revise the conclusions and recommendations as suggested in this review to better support decision making. The conclusions seem blended with the recommendations and suggest to decide how best to launch the recommendations by upgrading the findings to findings and conclusions (and they may need to be reduced to those that will launch the recommendations in order to stay within the page limits and inform the decision makers) or adding a conclusion section, or placing the conclusion just ahead of the related recommendation. The recommendations contain findings and justification which should be part of the conclusions. Suggest to use assertive statements, avoiding duplicative wording such as "it is recommended" since they are recommendations. The objectives and ToR call for lessons learned and a few key lessons can be added (Note: Please place the Executive Summary in the Table of Contents. Suggest to use "The" before USP when it starts the sentence to add to readability.)
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 summary contains all needed elements, it is noted to include some lessons. (Note: It is not needed in the exec sum to mention informant sources such as "several stakeholders" particularly for the recommendations.)
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 includes all significant information and does not introduce new information.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		86%	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	The subject of the evaluation is described in Section 2. it describes the history of the project, the timelines, the budget and the end date of the project in 2022. The intervention pillars are brought in Section 2.2 and various facets of the project are described. Objectives and results are clearly outlined in 2.3 and Table 1 provides the targets. The budget composition is noted in Figure 4 with the original budget and amount after the extension. (Note: it can be mentioned that the detailed budget breakdown is presented in the Findings: Efficiency section.)
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).	Yes	Section 2.6 includes a mapping of the USP stakeholders and their roles. Table 2 includes the duty bearers and the rights holders. The targets among the population groups are mentioned in Table 1 including school children and persons being served at health centers. Please bring up the actual numbers reached against the target which are discussed later in the report. Please note in the background whether data was disaggregated to age, gender and disability among the served populations as mentioned in the limitations section later in the report.
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	Section 1.1 covers the socio-economic and demographic context. Section 1.2 discusses the national water and sanitation situation, including progress toward the national development goals for water services. (One minor suggestion is to enhance Figure 1 as the axes and legend are very hard to read).

	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	Section 1.3 covers the national strategy for the WASH sector and linkages are drawn to national goals, the MDGs and SDG6. The glossary in Annex 6 refers to SDG 6.2, which defines basic sanitation as the use of improved facilities not shared between households and limited sanitation as use of improved facilities shared between households. Other definitions from SDG 6.2 are also included. Suggest that these definitions are referred to in the main text and that specific targets related to the SDG 6 are discussed in relation to the targets set by the project in Section 2.3.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The institutional situation with regard to WASH is well described and the needs in urban areas. However, there is little information on the most vulnerable who lack access to water and sanitation services and what the impact is on their health and well being. Suggest to add a paragraph or more explaining these aspects as well as who the most vulnerable groups and individuals are, such as those living below the poverty line, migrants, marginalized populations, persons living in slums, persons affected by conflict, women and children, persons with disabilities, persons suffering diseases, among others. Some groups of concern are mentioned in the methodology section, the migrant girls, the Kayayei, the persons living with disabilities and those in humanitarian situations such as refugees. What is their WASH situation? What is their health situation and can it be linked to WASH services? What needs to be improved so that the project goal is attained?
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).	Yes	Tables 2 and 3 cover the mapping with Table 2 describing the roles of the stakeholders and Table 3 providing the evaluation users and their uses.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	Table 2 provides the specific contributions and roles of the key stakeholders, including UNICEF. Further details appear in the text.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	92%	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 sets out the purpose and objectives. The dual purpose is accountability and learning. The accountability purpose describes the need for providing evidence of effectiveness after eight years of implementation, and for organizational learning to inform future programmes. Section 3.3 clearly sets out the intended users and uses on Table 3.
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	The objectives are clear and complete and match those provided in the ToR.
	ii Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Partially	Section 4 provides the evaluation scope, thematic, geographic and chronological. Findings will not be presented by district but by the project as a whole. These three points of discussion are very abbreviated compared to the scope in the ToR which lists the specific programme areas. Suggest that the ToR thematic scope be repeated in the report and if all the areas cannot be considered to give reasons why.
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 2.4 presents the Theory of Change (ToC) discussion. It presents the assumptions, and a summary of the outputs to outcomes is given.
	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	The ToC graphic diagram is found in Annex 2 and includes activities, results, specific objectives, purpose and goals with linkages and causal connections between them.
	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 has been formulated by the evaluation team based on the USP planned activities and expected results.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	82%	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.	Partially	Section 5 presents the main evaluation questions as set out in the ToR, following the OECD-DAC criteria. The text says the full list of questions is provided in Annex 3 evaluation matrix with sub-questions. The questions on the matrix belong to a different programme concerning sexual and reproductive rights, and suggest that the wrong one is dropped in. One question pertains to UNICEF and UNFPA support for the programme's implementing partners and UNFPA has not been mentioned in this regard. Please explain whether this matrix came from a different project or programme and insert the correct matrix.
	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.	Partially	The evaluation matrix cannot be judged as it concerns the incorrect programme. The structure would be satisfactory. This needs to be rectified, (Note: Suggest to add Evaluation Matrix as a separate annex as it is currently mixed with the additional details on the methodology and data collection tools. Place on the Table of Contents to show where the matrix is as it is a required component.)
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	The evaluation design and set of methods is relevant and robust for the purpose, objectives and scope. The evaluation design and methods are clearly described in the text and in Annex 2. The evaluation approach, methods and tools are all included in Section 6.
	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 for the participative approach and details of the qualitative and quantitative sources are set out in Tables 4 and 5. The evaluation included a survey to assess data from a range of households.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy is provided in detail in Annex 3, section 3.3 (Note: it is mentioned as Annex 2 in the text so please correct.) and this strategy is very detailed as to how the survey communities, WASH committees, health facilities and communities, among others were selected. Tables listing the sampled communities and the survey response rates are presented and the male and female groups listed.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis are well described in Annex 3, 3.4 and suggest that some of this discussion is brought to the main text, The methods of analysis section in the annexes is not long and the quality assurance of data is important to summarize or bring to the main text.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for drawing out the causal connections and is clearly noting the targets and the Theory of Change. Suggest that the constructed Theory of Change could be means of testing the Theory against the findings and the methodology draw on the ToC since it was a means for the team to understand what the project intended to achieve among the inputs, outputs and 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	Limitations and mitigation measures are featured in Sections 6.2.5 and are discussed in detail in terms of interventions at the household level and at schools and health facilities. There are a number of important limitations mentioned such as the limitations on the two-step sampling but this does not appear on the matrix and should appear there in summary form. Suggest that it is included in the matrix even though a narrative is provided on the issue. (Note: Please label the limitations table and place it in the Table of Contents.)
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	Compliance with ethical standards is addressed in section 6.2.3 where all ethical standards are covered including UNEG and the Ethical Guidelines. Annex 4 fully outlines the compliance with Ghana ethical standards, and Geros standards.

	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	Section 6.2.3 discusses compliance with ethical standards and describes the approach for gender equity among informants. The data collection respected all rights of children and youth in view of the procedures for Ethical Research involving children. Annex 4 covers further the compliance with ethical standards and evaluation principles both GEROS and Ghanian.
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.	No	No innovation practice was noted.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	92%	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	The findings are very clearly structured by criterion and the evaluation questions listed and systematically addressed such that the answers to each are well substantiated. A summary of each criterion appears at the end of each section along with evaluator rating.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	The findings discuss targets/planned results alongside the Pillars of the interventions, but do not refer to the Theory of Change. The Effectiveness section discusses the positive effects of demand generation on page 40 which is a major causal connection in the ToC and this could be noted. Suggest that the Findings highlight where the ToC is valid and where the causal connections were less effective and why, and where assumptions held or did not, in order to support the modification of the ToC for future use. The ultimate goal is to improve survival and urban development of children in Ghana and unclear how the project was close to achieving progress toward the goal.
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 findings present credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data which are effectively demonstrated in narrative and diagrammatic and table forms. The discussion presents both output and progress toward outcome of sustainable WASH services such as challenges with the loan repayments, page 42. Triangulation is evident.
	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 and respond to the evidence presented both positive and negative. Tables clearly present actual against the targets and Boxes highlight some important technical and results information such as Box 4 on Key features and results of the Basic Sanitation Fund. The findings are very informative such that readers can grasp even the small details of implementation. (Note: Please include the Boxes in the Table of Contents.)
	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 Findings explore the causal factors related to both positive and negative findings. The discussions of why achievements, partial or non-achievements took place are well developed, such as whether the inputs were adequate to achieve the intended results, such as the discussion on 7.2.1.2 on emptying services.
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	Section 7.2.4 focuses on the effectiveness of the Metropolitan, Municipal and district assemblies (MMDA) M&E system which notes that the USP put into place an effective system with regular updates following the main indicators and posting progress reports publicly. Various examples of steering of the project are presented throughout the findings. The development of the system validates a project objective: MMDA are able to monitor and evaluate their work leading to improved access and hygienic use of improved sanitation facilities in communities and schools.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	63%	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	Conclusions (Section 8) are clearly formulated and touch upon the criteria. However, they are fairly general, in some cases summarize findings, and do not always focus on launching the recommendations and substantiate why they are needed, in effect by "selling" them to the users. Suggest to introduce the conclusions section by reviewing the purpose and objectives of the evaluation to remind readers. Note that one objective involves "looking at facilitating and hindering factors, key entry points, missed opportunities, and governance arrangements" and suggest to ensure that the conclusions include these aspects as applicable and that they set the stage for and validate the need for the recommendation(s).
	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 derived from findings but some stay at that level and are not developed in more depth in order to launch the recommendation(s). For the first recommendation on demand generation, what conclusion informs on the strengths and the issues in creating a stronger demand including stronger demand from the poor and vulnerable? For the second: What were the issues in the supply side development? Suggest to review the conclusions to ensure that the facilitating and hindering factors in project planning and implementation are brought to a high level of analysis pinpointing and refining them, and are clear to readers and substantiate why recommendations are needed. Suggest to number the conclusions and match them with the recommendations so that readers can easily link them.
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.	Yes	The lessons are presented in section 8.2 and the introduction indicates that the lessons are applicable to similar projects and programmes and are presented by the pillars of the project. This is an effective means of setting them out.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons are strung together by bullet points under topics and there are 3-8 bullets under each topic. Typically lessons are presented as strong generic statements with details for their support. Some of the bullet points are findings and some are recommendations. Suggest to reformulate to a strong lead generic and widely applicable lesson perhaps encompassing some of the bullets, and then mention the evidence from the evaluation that supports it preferably in narrative form, sharing that experience. Suggest that 5-6 well formulated key lessons are put forth and any remaining can be placed in the annexes.
SECTION G:		RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	75%	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	The recommendations (8) are formulated by strategic and operational, and Tables 11 and 12 effectively sum them up with recipients and level of priority. Some of the recommendations include what should be in the conclusions, a substantiation and launching the recommendation. Suggest to review the relationship between the conclusions and recommendations and ensure that the conclusions are numbered so the recommendations can refer to them and the connection will be clear to readers.
	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 are useful and actionable. However, the actions are not clearly set out and thus seem a bit uncertain. Suggest they should be more assertive, and list conclusively the way that they should be implemented. Suggest to bullet them so that each action is clear.
	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).	Yes	The process for developing and validating the recommendations is described. Some emanated from the data collection process and some were developed through consultations and discussions with key stakeholders; the list of participants in the validation meeting is found in Annex 7.
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 a clear identification of duty bearers on Tables 11 and 12 responsible for action. The recommendations are clustered by strategic or operational. They are clearly prioritized.
SECTION H:		REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	86%	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 include the name of the object, the timeframe of the evaluation, the date of the report, organization of the evaluators and their contacts, commissioned by UNICEF, table of contents including the tables and figures, annexes, acronyms and page numbers.
	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 (7) include the terms of reference, the USP Theory of Change diagram, the methodology details and interview tools, (Noted: the incorrect evaluation matrix to be replaced in a separate annex), compliance with ethical standards, the bibliography, a glossary and attendance from a validation meeting. The site visits are included in the text, but the list of interviewees for KIIs are missing, please include this. (Note: Check to ensure that the ToR link in Annex 1 is working or include the entire ToR.)
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).	Yes	The structure is easy to navigate in numbered sections, clear titles and well formatted.
	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 accords to 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 has specified that the report be a maximum of 45 pages. The text is 55 pages without the executive summary and annexes. The large number of questions with technical information required is acknowledged and there is little extraneous text. There are a number of figures, tables, boxes and photos included. Suggest to reach an agreement on the number of pages that the team and management find acceptable. Some of the figures and tables can be placed in the annexes.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is very well written, easy to understand and generally free from grammatical errors.
	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	There is very frequent use of visual aids including 21 Figures, 12 tables, boxes with highlighted examples, and photographs which all contribute to the findings and inputs and outputs discussions.
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	Section 7.1 under the relevance findings notes the project's design as being aligned with the CRC, the CCC and the CEDAW which have been ratified by Ghana as answers to the relevant question.
	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 and the ToR mentions the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) as reviewers for the report, however links to this group are not found in the inception report or the final report. Please note in the methodology section, the existence of a reference group and what their role has been in the process of the evaluation. They may be listed by name as well.
	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	The language is empowering and inclusive and avoids bias. The terminology of duty bearers and rights holders is used. Data is disaggregated for the school children in Table 7. Lack of readily available disaggregated data is noted as a limitation which did not improve significantly with mining by the team.
	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	Annex 4 reviews the evaluation pro-active stance on child rights and reviews the Geros guidance on equitable representation. Persons with disabilities (PWD) are included in the evaluation tools and data collection and Section 7.5.3 reports on the findings regarding integration of rights based approach and PWD in the USP.
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.	Fully integrated	GEEW (therein termed Gender, Human Rights and Equity - GHRE) is fully integrated in the scope of analysis as described the purpose of the evaluation and the methodology describes the cross cutting issue of GHRE
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology section (6.2.3.1) describes the GHRE principles in the evaluation process. The tools and data collection processes included gender sensitive approaches including a balance of the sexes in the focus group discussions.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The Findings Section includes analysis of the gender equity of the project including the gender segregation of toilets, and gender focused triggering meetings. An entire section in the Findings is devoted to GHRE analysis of the project, while not a complete gender analysis.

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>