

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Formative and Summative Evaluation of the Childcare and Deinstitutionalisation Reforms in Tajikistan

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	85%	Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Formative and Summative Evaluation of the Childcare and Deinstitutionalisation Reforms in Tajikistan		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Tajikistan/66/2024/19354		
<b>Region</b>	ECAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2024		
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Europe and Central Asia Regional Office		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Tajikistan		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	October 7, 2024		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
Every child survives and thrives	No		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Programme		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	1, 4		
<b>EQA Summary:</b>	<i>The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.</i>		
<p>The information presented in the report is comprehensive and the report has a number of strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is a clear and relevant description of the intervention's context, i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional and international factors are presented and also how the country programme relates to the context. This includes a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rightsholders of the intervention.</li> <li>•Clear linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the areas being evaluated.</li> <li>•The evaluation's purpose and objectives are clearly presented and the evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation.</li> <li>•The evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope. They are fully and clearly described. The methodology allows for the drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.</li> <li>•Ethical principles are clearly presented and adhered to.</li> </ul> <p>The report had some weaknesses, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The report lacks an overall description of the intervention; there is no clear and separate presentation of the design of the country programme(s), components and activities. This makes it challenging to determine how and to what degree the UNICEF programme have contributed to the outputs and outcomes reported on.</li> <li>•The lessons are not clearly and concisely presented; they are a mix of facts, findings, observations and recommendations and are not formulated as lessons.</li> <li>•The Annexes appears to be unfinished; the annex document is messy and lack both a table of contents and page numbering. The annexes are not uniformly labelled (some with letters, some with numbers, some with the same number and some with the same topic but different content).</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.</i></p> <p>The following are recommendations for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The report would benefit from including a clear and comprehensive description of the evaluand, i.e. the intervention that is being evaluated, including the programme design with components and activities.</li> <li>•The report would benefit from presenting the lessons in a clear and concise manner. The difference between Facts, Findings, Lessons and Recommendations have been defined by IEG (the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group) as follows and might be useful:</li> </ul> <p>The Difference Between Facts, Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations</p> <p>Fact: What happened—an event and data (results). Not in dispute. Example: "The project manager was dismissed in year 5."</p> <p>Finding: What the analyst interpreted or concluded from the facts specific to the project. Can be disputed. □ Example: "Mainly because replacement of the project manager was delayed, the project did not meet its targets."</p> <p>Lesson: The broader significance of a finding. It draws a conclusion from experience that may be applicable beyond the project under review. □ Example: "Poor performance by project managers can critically affect project outcomes." Or: "If skilled project managers are not in place, it may affect the project performance negatively".</p> <p>Recommendation: Suggests how to proceed in the future in the light of this experience. Proposes actions. □ Example: "The borrower should ensure that key project management positions are filled with competent staff. The Bank should help ensure this through appropriate covenants and prompt supervision."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Finally, the annexes would benefit from proof reading and formatting prior to submission.</li> </ul>			

SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A:</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	67%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 1.</b>	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).	Yes	The Executive Summary is clearly presented, serves well as a standalone document useful for decision making and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users. It is 5 pages.
	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 Executive Summary includes most of the necessary elements, including the evaluation's purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned and key recommendations, as per the ToR. However, the overview of the intervention could have benefitted from more clarity and detail.
	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.	Partially	The Executive Summary does not include all significant information needed to understand the intervention. It lacks detail in describing the design and content of the programme (activities/components, etc). It does not, however, introduce new information from what was presented in the rest of the report.
<b>SECTION B:</b>	<b>BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>	86%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2.</b>	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Partially	The report lacks a clear and relevant description of the intervention, including the programme design, its activities, components and budget. The programme's timelines and implementation status are clear, and activities are included in the description of intervention's ToC.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	There is a clear and relevant description of the intended duty bearers by type, and there is a description of the rights holders (at national level). Rights holders are not presented by geographic locations and in terms of numbers reached, disaggregated by gender, age and disability. Figures are presented at the national level (and this is a national programme), but the numbers directly benefiting from the UNICEF programme is unclear. Gender disaggregated data for the whole evaluation period were unavailable such that it was not possible to provide a comprehensive analysis of the results for girls and boys. However, annual data for the years 2014 to 2022 show that the number of boys in residential care was at least twice the number of girls.
<b>Question 3.</b>	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention, including the relevant policies, the socio-economic, political, cultural, institutional and international factors, and how the intervention relates to this context.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Linkages to the SDGs and relevant target and indicators are drawn. Most relevant to this evaluation is SDG 16, Target 16.1 on significantly reducing all forms of violence and deaths; Target 16.2 on ending abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children; and 16.a on strengthening national institutions for building capacity at all levels to prevent violence. However, the reforms also relate to the SDGs 1, 3, 4, 5, 10 with their relevant targets outlined in Table 3 on page 7.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rights holders of the intervention. The evaluation covers childcare and DI reforms targeting all children (i.e. boys and girls under the age of 18 years), who are the rights holders and ultimate beneficiaries of the interventions. However, the evaluation pays special attention to the following groups of rights holders and beneficiaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children with disabilities, including girls and boys with long-term physical, mental (psycho-social), intellectual (cognitive) or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others; and</li> <li>• 'Hard to place' children, namely, boys and girls for whom it is often difficult to find a durable family-based placement.</li> </ul>
<b>Question 4.</b>	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		

	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	The report identifies the implementing agencies, the development partners, rights holders and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders, and of the linkages between them. The rights holders are described under question 3.i. The primary duty-bearers are, at the national level, the Ministry of Education and Science (MoES), Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Population (MoHSPP), Ministry of Labour, Migration and Employment (MoLME) and the National Child Rights Commission. At the sub-national levels, the primary duty bearers are the local Child Rights Commissions or Child Rights Units, Departments of Education, guardianship and trusteeship authorities (GTAs), Department of Health and Department of Labour, Migration and Employment throughout the territory of Tajikistan. Though they are not 'primary duty bearers' (as international child rights obligations fall upon the state), the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors (namely, public organisations, non-State academic and training bodies, international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international organisations, particularly UNICEF) in implementing or supporting the implementation of childcare and DI reforms throughout the territory of Tajikistan are also examined. A summary of the rights holders, duty-bearers and other implementing stakeholders is provided in Table 1 on pp 1-3.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The report identifies the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders, including UNICEF. In addition to the table outlining the roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders in Table 1 on pp 1-3, details of the interventions which comprise the object of the evaluation and the non-financial contributions of the key stakeholders involved are set out in Part 4.1.1 under evaluation question 1.2. Details of UNICEF's (non-financial) contribution are set out in Part 4.1.6.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at this point in time, its intended use and key intended users. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide a rigorous assessment of the results of DI and childcare reforms undertaken by the government of Tajikistan and UNICEF, with a particular focus on girls and boys with disabilities and hard-to-place children (girls and boys for whom it is often difficult to find a durable family-based placement). The evaluation's geographical scope covers programming across Tajikistan at both national and sub-national levels. The intended users of the evaluation are UNICEF ECARO, UNICEF Tajikistan Country Office, the government of Tajikistan (the MoES, MoHSPP, MoLME and Ministry of Finance), local governments of the regions and districts in Tajikistan, public organisations, international NGOs, UN agencies and donors.
<b>Question 6.</b>	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of what the evaluations seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the ToR. The objectives of the evaluation are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the impact of government child care policies and understand what worked and what did not in the DI of children, in particular children with disabilities and other hard to place children, how and why;</li> <li>• Determine the effectiveness, impact, coherence, relevance and efficiency of national childcare reforms;</li> <li>• Assess the actual and potential contribution of UNICEF's work to national progress (including the outcomes and impacts of programming) in DI and childcare reforms, including children with disabilities and other hard to place children; and</li> <li>• Identify lessons and provide recommendations for refinement and potential scaling up of good practices to further support national governments in strengthening child protection systems.</li> </ul>
	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	There is a clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation, what will and will not be covered, including the reason for the scope. The object of this evaluation is the national childcare reforms undertaken in Tajikistan between 2009 and the end of 2022, with a focus on deinstitutionalization (DI), children with disabilities and children for whom it is often difficult to find a durable family based placement ("hard to place children"). The evaluation does not include the detention of children in conflict with the law but does include children at high risk of coming into conflict with the law for so-called "delinquent" behaviour. The evaluation does not provide an assessment of inclusive education, early detection and intervention in disability cases, broader social protection programming to alleviate poverty but instead identifies any barriers or bottlenecks for children in the child protection system in accessing these services.
<b>Question 7.</b>	Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a clear description of the intervention's intended results (on pp. 12-13), of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to and being tested by the evaluation.

	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 causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in both narrative and graphic form in the presentation of the programme's Theory of Change (Part 2.4) on pp 12-13.
	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 Theory of Change was retroactively constructed by the evaluators.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and the questions are organized under each related 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 includes, in addition to questions and sub-questions, indicators, data collection methods, data analysis techniques and the data sources.
<b>Question 9.</b>	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, and they are clearly and fully described in the report. The methodology was equity, gender and rights-based and adopted a theory-based approach to determine whether, how and why (or why not) childcare reform initiatives have led to the changes set out in the reconstructed ToC. The evaluation was also consultative and participatory and involved a gender-responsive methodology.
	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 they include both qualitative and quantitative sources, and are all clearly described. The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach to data collection and analysis, incorporating both quantitative (using secondary/administrative data) and qualitative methods to gather data that is rich and explanatory, as well as accurate and measurable and to improve the validity of results through triangulation. The evaluation involved a desk review, analysis of secondary or administrative data and primary data collection through KIIs, individual interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) with children, young people, parents/carers and professionals and practitioners. Data collection was carried out with stakeholders at the national level in Dushanbe or, where necessary, online and at the sub-national level in three locations: Dushanbe; Sughd Province; and Khatlon Province.
	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 and it includes a description of how diverse perspectives are captured. The sampling strategy for the selection of participants was primarily purposive and non-random. Purposive sampling prioritised diversity to ensure that respondents of diverse backgrounds and with diverse perspectives were included in the evaluation as well as a gender balance and inclusion of persons with disabilities. The research locations were selected in consultation with the UNICEF country office and the Evaluation Reference Group, which included the capital city as well as locations in which there was a high prevalence of residential institutions and childcare service providers.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including qualitative and quantitative analysis and triangulation, in section 3.6 on page 20.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology is theory based and allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	Table 6 on pp 20-21 provides a list with a clear and completed description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence and how these limitations were addressed.
<b>Question 10.</b>	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		

	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	Section 3.9 of the report (p 22) outlines the ethical considerations taken in this evaluation. There is explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators and to the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines. It is stated that all research was carried out in full accordance with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines, Coram International's own Ethical Protocol and Guidelines (Annex H) and UNICEF's Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation Data Collection and Analysis.
	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	There is a description of the ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (including respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, etc). Individual interviews or FGD were conducted with children (7–18 years) who were in residential institutions or alternative care or who had left an RI or childcare system. UNICEF procedures for ethical research involving children were adopted, most notably, through the application of UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis (2021) and application of a tailored ethical protocol for the evaluation in line with these standards.
<b>Question 11.</b>		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could 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.	Partially	The evaluation report indicates that it has sought to employ a theory-based approach that also draws on a realist approach alongside participatory systems mapping and agent-based modelling across all countries. While these approaches and methods are not entirely innovative (and are identified in the ToRs as 'appropriate designs for questions'), they demonstrate a thoughtful approach by the evaluation team. However, as there is limited description of these approaches and methods (and how they were applied) in the report, including the Annex, this is rated as 'partially' meeting this criteria.
<b>SECTION E:</b>		<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 12.</b>		Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	The findings marshal sufficient evidence of systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and sub-questions along the 6 criteria. The findings are organized by and presented under each of the evaluation criteria. All evaluation questions and sub-questions are presented and numbered in the findings section, and all of them are directly addressed with description of relevant findings, first in a summary section and then in a more elaborate section.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	There is use of the intervention's results framework or ToC in the formulation of the findings.
<b>Question 13.</b>		Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		
	i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome level data as relevant to the evaluation framework, and triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.
	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 clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative, and they are based on clear performance indicators or other means of comparison as relevant for each question. For example, the main findings under the Relevance criteria are presented as follows: "Relevance: Legal and policy reforms in Tajikistan have been extremely relevant to DI, have been based on international child rights standards and have paid close attention to the DI of children with disabilities. More recently, these reforms have paid closer attention to the children left behind and children at high risk of coming into conflict with the law. However, little attention is given in the policy framework to the gendered dynamics of institutionalisation. Services introduced during the evaluation period have been relevant to DI but have focused more on preventing family separation and the institutionalisation of children with disabilities than on family-based alternative care. Stakeholders' views on the relevance of childcare and DI reforms vary. UNICEF's input has been intrinsically linked with national childcare and DI reforms though the indicators on strengthening the social service workforce (SSW).

	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	Causal factors leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified, as can be exemplified by the conclusion on sustainability: "The reforms to date are partly sustainable. There have been sustained changes in the legal framework through the adoption of laws and policies on childcare which broadly align with international childcare standards. However, without a clear roadmap for the closure/ transformation of RIs and reallocation of resources from RIs to establishing a continuum of care and community-based services, there is a risk that the progress in reducing the overall numbers of children in RIs will be reversed or remain stagnant. The reliance on NGOs and siloed approach for the provision of community-based services will also require a sustained commitment from government to fund these services." The evaluation also analyse the intervention's logical chain .
<b>Question 14.</b>	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Partially	While an assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system is provided on page 36, it does not go into details regarding its completeness of performance framework, including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage, however.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 15.</b>	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect well the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward-looking.
	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	While the conclusions are organized along the line of the evaluation criteria (as are the findings), there are no explicit references in the presentation of the conclusions as to which findings they are derived from.
<b>Question 16.</b>	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	No	Only three "lessons" are presented (on pp 58-59). They are not formulated as lessons, however, they are rather a mix of facts, findings, evaluation observations and recommendations. It is unclear what the lessons actually are. They are specific to this intervention and do as such not have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	The lessons are not clearly or concisely presented.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partially	The recommendations seem to align with the evaluation purpose. There is no clear reference, however, to which the evaluation questions, findings or conclusions each recommendation is derived from. The recommendations are presented along the lines of emerging themes in the report rather than organised according to the evaluation criteria (as are the evaluation questions and the findings).
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses and guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate. For example, Recommendation 4 reads "Case management: The MoES, with UNICEF's technical expertise, leads efforts to finalise the legal, procedural and institutional reforms at the local level to ensure a uniform referral pathway and gate-keeping mechanism for children entering the childcare system, including: removing the distinction and ambiguities between the Child Rights Commissions and GTAs; introducing child protection case management protocols and standards; and ensuring that trained social workers are designated to manage child protection cases on behalf of the designated child protection authority."
	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 the recommendations is described and it includes the involvement of duty bearers and rights holders when feasible. The recommendations below were developed with UNICEF and the ERG, through written and oral consultations. The evaluators had also asked rights-holders for their views on what should be done to improve childcare reforms during the primary data collection, which were taken into account in developing the recommendations.
<b>Question 18.</b>	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	There is a clear identification of groups of duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation and there is a clear prioritization of recommendations to support use.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 19.</b>	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		

	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages include the name of the evaluated object, the evaluation's timeframe, date of the report, location of the evaluated object, names and organization of the evaluators, name of the commissioning organization, a table of contents (although the table of contents for the annexed is missing), including tables and figures, a list of acronyms and appropriate page numbering (while the annexes lacks page numbers, though).
	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 lack a table of contents and page numbering. They are also labelled in an ad-hoc manner (the annex that is placed as the second annex, for example is called Annex 1, and introduces as "19. Annexes") It is as such difficult for the reader to get an overview of the annexes. The annexes include: The evaluation's terms of reference (annex 1); an annex with country specific summary results (also annex 1), a list of relevant documents (annex 2) (but it only contains 5 documents, which seems odd given the size of this evaluation); An annex (3) on Ethical Guidelines and Considerations; An annex (4) with the tentative structure of the country evaluation report; An annex 5 called "What we mean by success in DI reforms"; then there's an "Annex B" with the Theory of Change; An Annex C with an overview of amendments to the evaluation questions; an Annex D with the Evaluation Matrix, Annex E with data collection tools (64 pages for that one annex); Annex F; Categories and number of research participants; Annex G, Evaluation Reference Group Members; Annex H Ethical Protocol and Guidelines (same topic, different content to Annex 3); (no Annex I?), Annex J Participant Information Sheet and Consent form; Annex K: List of Residential Institutions in Tajikistan; Annex L: Budget and funding sources. It does not include a list of site visits.
<b>Question 20.</b>	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Partially	The structure of the main report is easy to identify and navigate with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles and it generally is well formatted (only with some erroneous references and links). The Annexes, however, lack a table of contents (neither in the main report's table of contents nor in the Volume 2 annexes), and it also lack page numbering, making it difficult to navigate and to get an overview. They have not been organized or formatted; the annexes do not have a uniformed labelling (some with the same annex number, some labelled with numbers, others labelled with letters, - two different annexes dealing with ethics and a full list of documents seems to be missing (only 5 documents listed). The annexes document is messy and appears unfinished.
	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 report structure accords to UNICEF's guidelines for evaluation reports. The context, purpose and methodology precede findings, which are followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
<b>Question 21.</b>	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The report is of a reasonable length; 60 pages and does not exceed the number of pages specified in the ToR.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The main report is easy to understand, written in an accessible way for the intended audience and is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is a frequent use of visual aids, with 5 figures and 9 tables.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 22.</b>	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	There are clear and specific references to and use of rights-based frameworks throughout the evaluation.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	There is a clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation. Stakeholders were involved as informants and an evaluation reference group of representatives from key stakeholder bodies provided oversight at strategic points in the evaluation process. This included participating in an evaluability assessment, consultations during the inception phase and consultation and validation of the final report. Views of rights-holders provided during interviews were incorporated into the recommendations.
	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, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias. The terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is used, and data is disaggregated by marginalized groups wherever possible (where data is available) and differential results are assessed.
	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 assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind, and it is clearly disability inclusive.

<b>Question 23.</b>	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	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	The evaluation assessed whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results. The evaluation included an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations. There was a standalone criterion on gender and human rights included in the evaluation framework, and there were dedicated evaluation questions and sub-questions regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The evaluation specified how gender issues were addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex. The evaluation methodology employed a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. A diverse range of data sources and processes were employed to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility. The evaluation methods and sampling frame addressed the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate. Ethical standards were considered throughout the evaluation and all stakeholder groups were treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation report has a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific and relevant social groups and outlines relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality. The findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups. Unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not described in the report. The evaluation report provides specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area.

#### SWAP Rating Guidance

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