

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

**Final Evaluation of UNICEF's intervention 'System building and capacity strengthening of the Ministry of Education and its sub-national Directorates of Education for effective delivery of quality education outcomes in Iraq'**

## REPORT RATING SUMMARY

<b>Overall Rating</b>	92%	Highly Satisfactory
●●●●● Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	Exemplifies UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●○ Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●○ Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●○ Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●○ Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

## REPORT DETAILS

<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Final Evaluation of UNICEF's intervention 'System building and capacity strengthening of the Ministry of Education and its sub-national Directorates of Education for effective delivery of quality education outcomes in Iraq'
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Iraq/59/2023/19650
<b>Region</b>	MENA
<b>Year of report</b>	2023
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Iraq Country Office
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Iraq
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes
<b>Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	January 19, 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	Yes
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No
Every child has an equitable chance in life	No
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Joint 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>	SDG 4 (Target 4.1, Indicators 4.1.1 and 4.1.2)

**EQA Summary:** 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.

The report is generally of exceptionally high quality;

- The report is well written, tidy, clear and succinct. It has a clear language and is well edited. The report structure is in line with UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports; the context, purpose and methodology precede the presentation of the findings, which are followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
- The methodology chosen is appropriate and adequate for the evaluation purpose and is clearly and well described and ethical considerations have been thoroughly taken into account and clearly and fully described. The context of the intervention is clearly described, and how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention is outlined in the background section.
- The presentation of the findings are clear and well backed up by evidence derived from clearly identified sources.
- The lessons learned and conclusions are clearly derived from the findings presented earlier, and the recommendations build on the conclusions.

**Recommendations for Improvement:** 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.

A weakness in the report was related to the presentation of the recommendations.

- All recommendations were directed at duty bearers (UNICEF, EU, UNESCO) and thus the responsibility for the follow up of the recommendations becomes diluted and unclear.
- There was no clear prioritization of the recommendations.

## SECTION RATINGS

<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	100%	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 and serves well as a standalone document useful for informing decision making. It is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (4 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.	Yes The Executive Summary includes all relevant elements, such as a good overview of the intervention, a clear outline of the evaluation purpose, objective and intended audience. The methodology is well described, and key findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations are clearly presented.

	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 Executive Summary includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation and it does not introduce new information not presented in the main part of the report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2. Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</b>				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The Background section contains a clear and relevant description of the intervention, including locations, timelines, financing and implementation status.
	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).	Yes	The report provides a clear and relevant description of the intended rightsholders and duty bearers by type, geographic location and in terms of numbers reached. Relevant information is disaggregated by gender and other parameters as appropriate. Specifically, the report states that the project targeted teachers at governorate level, as well as education planners, statisticians and other relevant staff in the MoE at central and governorate level. The indirect Rights Holders are the students and pupils visiting Iraqi schools, including vulnerable school children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Teachers are secondary Rights Holders in this context.
<b>Question 3. Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</b>				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The context of the intervention is clearly described, and how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention is outlined in the background section. This includes a description of the decline of the education system through the many violent conflicts in the recent years, the status and role of teachers and the need for quality teacher training, and the need for an operational and solid EMIS.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Clear linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant target indicators for the areas being evaluated. The project's three SOs are linked to SDG 4. However, due to the intermediate nature of the three SOs' interventions, the evaluation could assess the impact of the project on the relevant indicators of SDG 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.5.1 and 4.c.1.
	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 rightsholders of the intervention, and the relevance of the intervention to the beneficiaries' needs is also assessed. The project targeted teachers at governorate level, as well as education planners, statisticians and other relevant staff in the MoE at central and governorate level. The indirect Rights Holders are the students and pupils attending Iraqi schools, including vulnerable school children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Teachers are secondary Rights Holders in this context. The project's design was overall sensitive to the needs of target groups and the context. This is because the EMIS system and the capacity to use it, as well as the GESPs and the capacity to implement them were strongly in line with those needs, including from the perspective of GEDSI. The two Strategic Objectives were also in line with the overall objective of improving learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education for all girls and boys in Iraq. This was similarly true of the building of teachers' teaching capacities, with the caveat that the longer-term relevance of e-learning to doing this is more ambiguous.
<b>Question 4. Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?</b>				
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	Implementing agencies, development partners, right holders, duty bearers and other relevant stakeholders are identified and described and the linkages and collaboration between them are analysed, assessed and clearly presented.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	There is a clear identification of the specific contributions and roles of the key stakeholders, both financial and otherwise, including UNICEF. A detailed and thorough table outlining all stakeholders and their role in the project in relation to all three objectives is presented (Table 2).
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>				
	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 outlined, 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 comprehensive understanding of the outcomes of UNICEF's activities to strengthen the education system in Iraq and to identify areas for improvement. The evaluation is both formative and summative in nature and aims to generate insights that are useful for the design and implementation of future initiatives on systems strengthening in education and in Iraq more particularly, as well as to foster accountability for the performance of the intervention and the results achieved.
<b>Question 6. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>				

	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 evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process, including a clear ToC. There is a clear statement that there are no deviations from the ToR. The project's Theory of Change (ToC) (Figure 2 on page 24) was developed on the basis of the short ToC included in the evaluation's Terms of Reference – which was insufficiently detailed to guide a theory-based evaluation. The ToC was thus further developed in the inception phase by the Evaluation Team – as well as the project design and preliminary discussions with key stakeholders during the inception phase. The ToC was validated during the inception phase by the Evaluation Steering Committee as part of the inception report. The ToC reflects the objectives and modalities of the project, and has been used as a framework to help visualise relationships between the different contributions towards its desired outcomes. A more detailed description of the project's ToC is included in Annex 9, and a graphic representation of it are included in Figure 2 on page 24.
	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	A clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation is presented, including the intervention scope, temporal and geographical scope, which are further described in sufficient detail on pages 26-27. The evaluation scope is as specified in the ToR.
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>		
	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	The report provides a clear description of the intervention's intended results at output and outcome level and provides a candid and thorough assessment of those (e.g. it is stated that there is solid evidence for achievements at output level, but weaker evidence (weaker results framework) for outcome level results.
	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 the outputs and outcomes are clearly presented in both the narrative and in a table (Table 1), and a good analysis of those is presented.
	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 program's Theory of Change is clearly presented and assessed on pages 15-16, and it is reconstructed and further detailed along the lines of the three objectives on the following pages of the report. A detailed, clear and logically sound ToC is presented on page 24, including specifications of external factors and causal assumptions.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>91%</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 and specified and aligned with the questions. This becomes particularly clear in the detailed evaluation matrix presented in Annex 5 which has organised all the evaluation questions along the evaluation 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 detailed and thorough evaluation matrix in Annex 5 includes indicators, benchmarks, and assumptions from which the analysis can be based on and conclusions drawn.
<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>		
	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 fully and clearly described. For example, the report outlines that the overall approach for the assignment is a theory-based approach rooted in contribution analysis. A main tool was the ToC, which was developed during the inception phase. The evaluation's approach also drew on the principles of outcome harvesting, by gathering data about the targeted outcomes, then working backwards and, guided by the results framework, determining the extent to which the interventions contributed to changes (if any) and particularly any unintended/unplanned effects. Taken together, these approaches helped to ensure the rigour and collective ownership of the data gathered, and thus the strength of the evaluation findings.

	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources are appropriate and include both qualitative and quantitative sources. They are clearly outlined in detail in the report. The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach, including both qualitative and quantitative elements. Such a methodology helps to ensure the rigour of the evaluation's findings, lessons learned and recommendations, by virtue of incorporating multiple types and layers of data. The evaluation's methodological approach to data gathering and data analysis included a literature review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, online perception surveys, field observations and review of the external environment.
	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, including a description of how diverse perspectives were captured. The sampling for primary data collection was purposive, ensuring appropriate representation of each respondent group and Rights Holders benefiting from each output area for the project. There is also a table outlining the detailed sampling approach per Specific Objective in Annex 11.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The report provides a clear and complete description of the methods of analysis. To facilitate rigorous data analysis including between different team members, the software Dedoose was used. Analysis of quantitative (survey) data was done in MS Excel and involved linking the data to evaluation questions to detail the perceptions of respondents (coding).
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology itself allows for drawing causal connections between the expected outputs and expected outcomes. The report points out that outcomes have been hard to measure due to weaknesses in the M&E system and in the intervention's results framework.
	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	The evaluation's risks, limitation and mitigation strategies are detailed and clearly laid out (p 30).
<b>Question 10.</b>	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The evaluation ensured adherence to all ethical considerations, in line with the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and the UNEG ethical guidelines. The measures taken in order to adhere to these principles are outlined in the report, and described in more detail in Annex 14.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The report provides a description of how the ethical safeguards for participants were applied (see also above).
<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.	No	Innovative practices were not used in this evaluation
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>100%</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 presented marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions, sub-questions and criteria. The report presents the findings backed up by evidence from clearly identified sources.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	There is explicit use of the interventions ToC and Results Framework in the formulation of the findings. The full Results Framework is presented in an annex.
<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. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources. Triangulation was used as a key tool for validating and analysing findings. The analysis included: contribution analysis, involving a systematic analysis of the results observed relative to the Theory of Change, including unintended results; analysis of data about the outcomes observed and determining if/to what extent the project contributed to them (informed by outcome harvesting principles and the COM-B Model of behavioural change). Financial process and cost-effectiveness analysis was also used in analysing secondary data.
	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. Each main finding presented is numbered and clearly state which evaluation questions the findings relate to. The numbered evaluation questions are listed in the Evaluation Matrix in Annex 5, where the evidence sources are outlined.
	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 the achievements or non-achievements of the results are clearly identified, as the presented findings are accompanied by analysis of the contributing factors.
<b>Question 14.</b>	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	There is a thorough and candid assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system to support decision making.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<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 the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are also 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.	Yes	The conclusions are appropriately derived from the findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that provides insights and analysis beyond the findings. There are clear links between the findings presented in the report and the conclusions drawn.
<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.	Yes	The identified lessons stem logically from the findings, and the finding numbers are referred to for each lesson presented which provides clarity and ease of reference.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are clearly and concisely presented and they do have sufficient detail to be useful for the intended audience.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	75%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 17.</b>	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose and they are clearly formulated. They are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, and it is made clear in the text which of the findings each of the conclusions are derived from.
	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. For example, one of the recommendations reads: "Revise and refine the project's Theory of Change by incorporating components aimed at building the ability and the will to robustly use the new capacities, tools and plans in the ways intended. The revised ToC should explicitly articulate risks, assumptions, and how the project will move from activities to outputs and outcomes. The observation here is that authoring strong plans, building strong data systems and building capacities for key stakeholders at the individual level are important, but not enough on their own given the broader, systemic-level changes aimed at by the project."
	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	It is stated in the report that a validation workshop with the key stakeholders on the recommendations of the final report was held on 26 November 2023, in Baghdad. The workshop included key stakeholders such as "representatives from the Ministry of Education and others" (p. 32 and p. 61).

<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.	No	The groups of duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation are identified, however, all the duty bearers are held responsible for all the recommendations; i.e. it is stated for each recommendation that it is directed at "UNICEF, the MoE, UNESCO and the EU". This is a dilution of responsibilities for each recommendation that is unfortunate. There is also no clear prioritization or classification of the recommendations to support use.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 19.</b>	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages of the report include the name of the evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of the evaluated object, names and organizations of the evaluators, name of the commissioning organization, table of contents including lists of tables and figures, list of acronyms and abbreviations and appropriately set 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.	Yes	The Annexes include the evaluation's Terms of Reference, an evaluation matrix, a list of interviewees, the Theory of Change and the intervention log frame, data collection instruments, and a list of documents reviewed, in addition to Implementation Status Tables for the specific objectives, an overview of the project's financial information, detailed sampling approach by each objective, a Gantt chart and timeline, and an annex outlining ethical considerations, confidentiality and data protection.
<b>Question 20.</b>	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report structure is easy to identify and navigate with numbered sections, clear title and sub-titles and it is 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 report structure is in line with UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports; the context, purpose and methodology precede the presentation of the 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 reasonable length; it is well written, clear, tidy and succinct.
	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 easy to understand, it is written in a accessible way for the intended audience and it 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 in the report, and these are clearly presented, labelled and referenced. The report contains 5 tables and 15 figures.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	79%	Comments on Rating
<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.	No	There is no mention of a rights-based frameworks such as CRC, CCC or CEDAW in the report.
	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	There is no mention of a reference group (apart from the Evaluation Steering Committee) in the report, but it is clear that stakeholders were involved as informants in data gathering and in validation workshops.
	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 in the report 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 group whenever appropriate.

	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 intervention and the evaluation were directed at system building and capacity strengthening of the Ministry of Education and targeted teachers at governorate level, as well as education planners, statisticians and other relevant staff at the MoE at central and governorate levels; child rights and the principle of Leave No-one Behind (including gender and disability) were relevant only indirectly. However, it is reported that gender equality/JbWMGB, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI) were mainstreamed through all activities, inputs and approaches for the project. Moreover, a gender/JbWMGB lens has been applied to all outputs and outcomes, including development of the EMIS and of EMIS reports, planning documents, training, and participation in all capacity building activities. A particular focus was applied to gender-based violence, commitments to sustainable development, as well as gender equality/JbWMGB and disability rights.
<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)	9	
	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 is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis to the degree that it is relevant, and the evaluation criteria and questions were designed in a way to ensure collection of GEEW-related data.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	A gender-responsive methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques were selected and used in the evaluation.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis wherever appropriate.

#### 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>