

EVALUATION ID

1410-2014/050

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
[UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
[UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

	Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	An Evaluation of the Child-to-Child School Readiness Programme in Ethiopia				
Report sequence number	2014/050	Date of Review	04-03-2015	Year of the Evaluation Report	2014
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office			Country	Ethiopia
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	Universal Management Group				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments
Geographic Scope (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>)	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country				
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)	2.4. Jointly Managed with Country: Evaluations jointly managed by the Country (Government and/or CSO) and the UNICEF CO				Joint managed with the Ethiopian Ministry of Education
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes				
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control				There is also a significant focus on measuring the short-term impact the CtCSR has had.

<p>SPOA Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action)</i></p>	<p>5.5 Education: Supporting global efforts to provide access to quality education for both boys and girls through improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education. Programme areas: a) Early learning b) Equity with a focus on girls' education and inclusive education c) Learning and child friendly schools d) Education in humanitarian situations</p>	
<p>Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i></p>	<p>6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.</p>	
<p>Approach</p>	<p>7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme</p>	

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

Question	cc	Remarks				
Object and context					<p>A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</p> <p>The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this.</p> <p>The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.</p>	Yes	<p>°Chap. 1 and 2 provide an adequate description of the object of evaluation, CtCSR. Some information is provided to illustrate how the CtCSR is meeting early educational needs in Ethiopia, but there is a lack of contextual information provided to further explain the underlying reasons (esp. social, economic, demographic) the Ethiopian educational system would benefit from the CtCSR.</p>				
<p>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies,</p>	Mostly	<p>°There was enough context provided to understand most of the findings, but there were specific findings, e.g. that the CtCSR had different relative outcomes regionally, that would have been illuminated by more demographic and socioeconomic information.</p>				
<p>3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</p>	Mostly					
Theory of Change			<p>°The object of the evaluation was clearly described but the context of the evaluation needed further information as to the cultural, social, and demographic context in which the CtCSR was implemented. No theory of change or type of logic model were clearly outlined. Key stakeholders needed more description and UNICEF's contributions were not explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>It is best evaluation practice to include a well articulated theory of change within the beginning of the evaluation report. Key stakeholders, including UNICEF, should be clearly identified and their contributions described as much as possible.</p>		
<p>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.</p>	No	<p>°The basic concept of how the designers thought the CtCSR would help prepare young children for a successful entry into school can be gathered from the description of the CtCSR but a complete results chain or logic model is not clearly articulated in the text or in the annexes.</p>				
Stakeholders and their contributions						

<p>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>oThrough reading on the CtCSR and stakeholder feedback about the program, it can be gathered that the key stakeholders are UNICEF, Ethiopian Ministry of Education, woreda officials, teachers, supervisors, parents and community members (ex. pg 32). But key stakeholders are never clearly identified. There are also key stakeholders mentioned in the ToRs that are not mentioned in the report (ex. Plan International).</p>	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p>	
<p>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>oWhat UNICEF and/or other key stakeholders have contributed to the program, either financially or other, was not described explicitly in the report.</p>		
<p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>oChp. 2 provided a good overview of how the CtCSR has grown since its original implementation as a pilot program and how its rapid expansion has caused changes to the original program design.</p>		
<p>Implementation Status</p>				
<p>8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>oChp. 2 provided a good overview of how the CtCSR has grown since its original implementation as a pilot program and how its rapid expansion has caused changes to the original program design.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The object of the evaluation was well described and the context of the evaluation was partially described. No theory of change, explicit identification of key stakeholders, or description of UNICEF's contributions to the programme were included.</p>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks						
Purpose, objectives and scope								
<p>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</p>	Mostly	<p>°It was clear from the report why the evaluation was conducted, although it was not as clear why it was specifically needed at this time. The end users of the evaluation and how they will use the information in the report were described but some details included in the ToRs (ex. that the report will be used to potentially scale-up the programme across Ethiopia) are not mentioned.</p>					<p style="text-align: center;">B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details</p>	Yes	<p>°The objectives and scope of the evaluation were well-described in Chap. 1 of the report. The scope, both geographically and time wise, are realistic. Evaluation questions (objectives) that are the focus of each chapter of the report help to provide further information and continually keep the report focused on the main purpose of the evaluation. The objectives and scope relate to the</p>						
<p>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)</p>	Yes	<p>°The objectives and scope of the evaluation were well-described in Chap. 1 of the report. The scope, both geographically and time wise, are realistic. Evaluation questions (objectives) that are the focus of each chapter of the report help to provide further information and continually keep the report focused on the main purpose of the evaluation. The objectives and scope relate to the</p>						
Evaluation framework								

<p>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</p> <p>It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Mostly	<p>There is a specific list of evaluation criteria or "key issues" in the ToR (pg. 4). This list appears to be based on the OECD/DAC criteria, but a similar list is not provided in the evaluation report. From the primary and secondary research questions provided (pg. 15), it can be understood how the key issues outlined in the ToR were incorporated into the evaluation, but a clear description of the key issues/evaluation criteria (and their justification) are not provided.</p>	Mostly Satisfactory	<p>A clear description of the overall purpose, objectives and scope was provided, but there was a lack of a as clear description of the basic framework of the evaluation. Although providing the primary and secondary evaluation questions helped, a more clear list would have helped demonstrate how the evaluation clearly addressed the key issues of interest listed in the ToR.</p> <p>Future reports will benefit from the inclusion of a clear evaluation framework to demonstrate that the evaluation was designed conceptually to address any and all relevant criteria. Description of the objectives and scope should continue to be well articulated.</p>
<p>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</p> <p>The rationale for using each particular non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.</p>	No			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section B</p> <p>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The objectives and the scope of the evaluation were provided in a clear manner, were realistic given the timeframe of the evaluation, and were related to the purpose of the evaluation. Primary and secondary research questions were provided but no clear evaluation framework, including justification for the inclusion or exclusion of evaluation criteria, was outlined.</p>			

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not ‘good’ or ‘bad’, they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>		
Data collection						
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	<p>Yes the report clearly identifies sources of data, how and why they were selected and discusses their limitations (pg. 16-18). It is clear that they used multiple sources of information in order to triangulate data and to ensure accuracy.</p>				
<p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p>	Yes	<p>Limitations inherent in the study design are described on page 19, including what was done to try to limit or overcome these limitations.</p>				
Ethics						
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	Yes	<p>The evaluation included how ethically the CtCSRPs selected both children enrolled in the program and the young facilitators. The randomized evaluation methodology itself and selection of various regions ensured that the evaluation did not unintentionally prevent certain groups from being included in the evaluation.</p>				
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	Yes	<p>The report mentioned that the evaluation was approved by the University of Toronto's Ethics Board (pg. 15). It was also mentioned (pg. 18) that informed consent was obtained from parents and students and the informed consent forms were provided in the appendices. No names were associated with direct quotes.</p>				
Results Based Management			Yes	<p>The evaluation methodology was clearly</p>		

Although some of the key evaluation

18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?

The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.

Yes

The report does identify that the project's budget does not include any allowance for "the type of monitoring and evaluation needed to ensure that the programme is delivered with fidelity to the original model..." (pg. 37). The CtCSR did not have an established M&E framework that could be evaluated by the evaluation team.

described, appropriate for the evaluation task at hand, and sufficiently sound to provide answers to the primary and secondary evaluation questions. The methodology was provided with a clear description of why certain methodological choices were made. Limitations are provided as well.

questions allowed for information to be gathered on gender equality and equity issues, there was a missed opportunity in this evaluation to incorporate a more substantial and purposeful human rights-based approach to the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation. Future reports should also be sure to clearly describe how stakeholders were involved throughout the evaluation process.

19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object?

In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.

N/A

But the lack of one was properly prioritized in the recommendation (pg. 80).

Human Rights, Gender and Equity

20 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?

This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority, To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.

Mostly

°There is some discussion of rights-based documents/conferences related to education. Although it is not clear that a human rights-based approach was incorporated into the evaluation framework since there is limited description of the evaluation framework. The analysis of the results and findings of the program did have focus on issues related to equity, social exclusion and gender.

21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks?

UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.

Yes

°Although the evaluation doesn't specifically assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights frameworks, the evaluation noted that the CtCRSP lacked an adequate M&E framework in general.

22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?

The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.

Mostly

°The lack of overt application of a human rights-based framework provided limited information in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations related to human rights and women's empowerment. But key questions incorporated into the evaluation were specifically interested in the regional and social/gender equity of the enrolment process of children into the CtCRSP. This provided more information regarding gender equality and equity,

23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?

The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.

Mostly

and cascaded down into the findings and conclusions.

24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?

The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.

Yes

Highly satisfactory

Stakeholder participation

25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?
 This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.

No

oBeyond their involvement as sources of information throughout the course of the evaluation, it appears from the report that stakeholders were only involved during the validation workshop held at the conclusion of the evaluation.

26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?
 The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.

No

oBecause it is not clear how or if stakeholders were involved with the evaluation beyond being sources of information, it is difficult to determine if a higher degree of participation may have been feasible.

Methodological robustness

27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution?
 The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.

Yes

oA counterfactual was developed in the form of a control group of schools/students who had not been exposed to the CtCSRPs but who lived in the same regions as the selected CtCSRPs schools. The control group's selection is well described on pg. 15 and appeared to be robust.

28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?
 The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.

Yes

oThe selection of a control group made it possible to address the primary

29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?

Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings

Yes

It possible to address the primary evaluation question and the other methodological tools (ex. surveys, interviews with key stakeholders/beneficiaries) facilitated answers to secondary questions.

Methodological limitations of the evaluation are clearly described, as was how they were either overcome (ex. random sampling, pg. 17) or mitigated (ex. blinding research assistants to the objectives of the evaluation pg. 19). They appear to be acceptable for the task in hand.

Executive Feedback on Section C

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

Up to two sentences

Overall, the methodology was robust, appropriate and helped to facilitate answering the primary and secondary evaluation questions. The methodology was sound enough that information regarding gender equality and equity was still able to be gathered despite a lack of explicit application of a human rights-based approach to the evaluation methodology and analytical framework.

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS					
Question	cc	Remarks			
Completeness and logic of findings					
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Yes	°The report's findings were clearly presented and organized based on which key evaluation question they related to and presented in Chapters 2-4. Outputs, outcomes and impacts were distinguishable. It was well-noted when and where certain findings were to be taken with caution due to type of data source (pg. 59).	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes	°Although no evaluation framework was articulated in the report, the findings do clearly address all of the key evaluation questions that were described both in the beginning of the report (pg. 15) and at the beginning of each chapter.			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes	°There was a demonstration of progression to results through the findings presented in Chapter 2, which focuses on the implementation and sustainability of the CtCSRP, that link with the findings based on the results of the project presented in Chapters 3 & 4.			The findings and conclusions were clearly presented and rooted in the presented evidence and sound analysis. The conclusions go beyond the findings and present reasonable judgments and insights to the evaluation object and evaluation purpose. Findings and conclusions were written in a manner that is accessible to a wide range of end users.
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes				

34 Are unexpected findings discussed?

If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.

Yes

°As mentioned above, it was well noted when certain findings had to be taken with caution. Limitations, such as the lack of baseline data and the lack of long-term cohort data (pg. 58), were also addressed.

°The evaluation revealed that although the CtCSRП significantly increased literacy and numeracy skills of children enrolled in the program, overall literacy skills were low of all children (intervention and control). This unexpected issue was addressed in the discussion section of the report (pg. 73).

Cost Analysis

35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?

Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.

Yes

°Chapter 2 (pg. 38) provides a limited cost analysis of the CtCSRП and compares it to another early childhood education readiness program, class zero. The financial sustainability of the program was also analyzed and concern was expressed that diminishing funding may be confused with diminishing efficacy of the program (pg. 38). For the information that was available to the evaluation team and the scope of the evaluation, the cost analysis was appropriate.

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	No	<p>°There was little obvious attempt to assign contribution for results to any stakeholders.</p>
<p>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes	<p>°There were causal reasons provided to help explain CtCSRП accomplishments and failures. For example, the finding that literacy tasks were less likely to be done by the YF was connected to the lack of complete materials that were available to each CtCSRП participant (pg. 76).</p>
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>°There was discussion (pg. 76) about how diminishing funding will affect both UNICEF-supported and non-supported woredas' ability to keep implementing the project in the way that it was originally intended and to scale-up the project to the entire country.</p> <p>°In Chp. 5 the conclusions discussed both the overall successes (strengths) of the CtCSRП and its weaknesses.</p>
<p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes	<p>They were organized based on the key questions of the evaluation project and did touch on issues related to human rights such as concerns that the selection of both students and YF may be designed in such a way that students who are in most need of the program are not as able to easily access the program compared to more relatively well-off families.</p>
Completeness and insight of conclusions		

Highly satisfactory

<p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</p> <p>Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Yes	<p>°The conclusions go beyond just repeating the findings and connect the results of the evaluation with underlying problems.</p>		
<p>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</p> <p>As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes	<p>°The conclusions include the views of students, YF, parents, teachers, and key stakeholders.</p> <p>°The conclusions are written in such a way that even if an end user did not understand the statistical analysis that represented a bulk of the report (Chp. 3 & 4), the take-home message of the evaluation could still be understood.</p>		
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</p> <p>Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Yes			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D</p> <p>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.</p> <p><i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The findings and conclusions were clearly presented and written in a way that is accessible to a wide range of end users. Causal reasons for project accomplishments and failures were outlined when possible, although there was a missed opportunity to clearly map each key stakeholders' contribution(s) to the CtCSR results.</p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</p>	Yes	<p>°The recommendations are clearly well-grounded in the evidence provided by the report and logically flow from the report's conclusions.</p>		
<p>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</p>	Yes	<p>°The recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation.</p> <p>°Recommendations had a separate section where they were outlined, but also appeared throughout the rest of the text. For example, (pg. 37) the report makes a recommendation to UNICEF that they should do a more in-depth cost analysis of the implementation of the program after providing their cost analysis. Furthermore, there are only five recommendations which provides prioritization but the numbering of the recommendations begins with 6</p>		
<p>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.</p>	Mostly			
Usefulness of recommendations			<p>The recommendations provided in the report are relevant to the object of evaluation but they do not clearly state the target groups for action, making them less actionable. They are prioritized inherently based on their small number (5), but some minor editing was missed to make sure that they were properly numbered. There were no lessons learned</p>	<p>Future reports should include both target groups for action for each recommendation. This will increase the likelihood for follow-up. Lessons learned, even when not specifically requested in the ToRs, should be included in the future.</p>
<p>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.</p>	No	<p>° None of the recommendations are clearly directed to any specific target group for action.</p> <p>°Most of the recommendations are realistic, with the partial exception of Recommendation 1: Expand resources</p>		

<p>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes</p>	Yes	to ensure quality and sustainability. This recommendation, while correct in its summary of the findings of the evaluation, would be more realistic if it would have been supported by potential avenues that are available for the target group to explore to secure resources to ensure quality and sustainability.	Mostly Satisfactory	included in the report.
<p>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.</p>	Mostly	o On pg. 9 it is mentioned that the report has incorporated feedback taken from stakeholders at a validation workshop held in Addis Ababa. But beyond this piece of information, there is no further description of how recommendations were developed.		
Appropriate lessons learned				
<p>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.</p>	Mostly	o There are no lessons learned provided in this report. As the CtCSR methodology has been implemented in other contexts (pg. 13), this was a missed opportunity to add to the general knowledge of best practices in implementing this type of education programme. Yet the development of lessons learned were not explicitly requested in the ToR, this question has been rated as mostly satisfactory.		
<p>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.</p>	Mostly			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Recommendations were prioritized and realistic, but did not include clear target groups for action. The process for developing the recommendations was not described and lessons learned were not included in the report.</p>			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
Style and presentation				
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Mostly	°The opening pages contain almost all of the expected basic elements. Missing is the timeframe of the evaluation, list of acronyms, and specific location(s) of the evaluated object.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	°The report was logically structured with the findings coming before the conclusions and recommendations. Although Chap. 2 (pg. 20-38) included a mixture of background information and findings on the projects implementation, because the findings were specific to the background information provided, it did not take away from the report's overall flow.	satisfactory	The opening pages of a report should always provide the reader with the necessary basic information of the evaluation and the evaluated object. While executive summaries should be concise, future reports should ensure that summarized details of all aspects of the evaluation report are included in order for the document to be able to stand alone.
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes	°The annexes contained appropriate elements. There was no document that was obviously missing, although a list of interviewees and site visits would have added further supportive information. The details provided on methodology and data collection instruments increased the usefulness and credibility of the report.		
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes			
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	°The executive summary is missing an explanation of the evaluation		

<p>56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations</p>	Mostly	<p>methodology. There are also limited details given as to the specific evaluation objectives. Most important findings and prioritized recommendations are given.</p> <p>°The executive summary provides enough detail to get a good sense that the program was successful but doesn't provide enough specific details (ex. methodology) to fully support this picture. It is short and concise but could have been expanded one or two more pages to provide more demonstration of the evaluations findings (including statistical figures that are the most telling of the obvious effect the program has had) and support for the provided conclusions/recommendations.</p>	Highly		
<p>57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments</p>	Mostly	<p>°The executive summary provides enough detail to get a good sense that the program was successful but doesn't provide enough specific details (ex. methodology) to fully support this picture. It is short and concise but could have been expanded one or two more pages to provide more demonstration of the evaluations findings (including statistical figures that are the most telling of the obvious effect the program has had) and support for the provided conclusions/recommendations.</p>			
<p>58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.</p>	Yes	<p>°The executive summary could be used to inform decision making. The priorities of the evaluation are highlighted and understood easily.</p>			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The report came together in a clear and organized way that read smoothly. There were minor issues that are easily fixed, such as the inclusion of the timeframe of the evaluation earlier on in the report and more details in the executive summary.</p>				
<p>Additional Information</p>					
<p>Question</p>	<p>Remarks</p>				

<p>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	<p>The evaluation report seemed to successfully address the Terms of Reference.</p>		
<p>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation</p>	<p>The evaluation created a robust control group and utilized proper statistical analysis (anova) to compare control and intervention groups while trying to account for potential confounding covariates.</p>		
<p>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>	<p>The evaluation demonstrated its education sector expertise when it analyzed the cultural relevancy of the program materials and mentioned that some materials needed to be reviewed or redone to better reflect the specific cultural context they are being applied in.</p>		
<p>OVERALL RATING</p>			
<p>Question</p>	<p>cc</p>	<p>Remarks</p>	<p>OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p>
<p>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>oThe evaluation's methodology was sufficiently rigorous, with a well constructed counterfactual and evidence of triangulation. The analysis and the findings logically give rise to the provided conclusions. The recommendations are realistic, but do lack clearly defined target groups for action.</p>	<p>The report fully addressed the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The methodology was well-described and robust, which provided for findings based on sound evidence. Although the evaluation should have included a description of the project's theory of change and more clearly described the evaluation framework. Recommendations were prioritized and actionable, but not fully targeted. But most shortcomings of the report were minor and easily overcome and the report conveys an overall sense that it can be used with confidence.</p>

<p>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical ‘whole’.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>°Generally, the report comes together in a logically consistent manner. The years of dates provided throughout the report were given based on the Ethiopian calendar, sometimes along with the corresponding year in the Gregorian calendar, but then sometimes only in Gregorian years. This made it harder for stakeholders outside of the Ethiopian context to understand the timeline of major project activities.</p>	<p>Highly satisfactory</p>
<p>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p>	<p>ToRs</p>	<p>The absence of clearly defined evaluation criteria in the ToRs (as opposed to key issues that were provided) may have been the reason for the lack of evaluation criteria in the report. Similarly, there is a lack of specific reference to incorporating a human rights or gender equality framework into the evaluation methodology.</p>	
	<p>Other</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The evaluation report comes together in logically consistent way and its robust methodology conveys confidence in its provided results. Although UNICEF's contributions should have been more clearly articulated and attributed to results where possible, this report can still be useful for UNICEF strategic management.</p>		