

Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation	Formative Evaluation of the Child Rights Monitoring Programme in Uzbekistan 2016-2018
Sequence No	2018/001
Region	ECAR
Office	Rep of Uzbekistan
Coverage	Uzbekistan

Evaluation Type Programme

Year of Report 2018

OVERALL RATING



Highly Satisfactory

Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may

Implications: use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)



Satisfactory

The report clearly describes the object of evaluation, including the projects making up the assessed programme, its timeline and implementation status, as well as its geographic coverage and budget. The report provides a good overview of the institutions directly benefitting from the programme and their role in national child rights monitoring (CRM) mechanisms. The report provides a good description of the programme's expected outputs and outcomes, and a theory of change which includes underlying assumptions and risks is presented in both a narrative and diagram format in Appendix 8.3.

Additionally, the report includes a section which explains the positioning of the CRM Programme within UNICEF's overall Country Programme in Uzbekistan. However, while key partners are identified, their roles and responsibilities in programme implementation are not clearly defined. Also, the rights-holders and the specific areas covered by the initiative could be better described.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)



Highly Satisfactory

The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described. It seeks to produce knowledge and recommendations at a critical point in time, as UNICEF is at mid-point in its Country Programme in Uzbekistan and is embarking on a new Strategic Plan. Evaluation findings are also expected to inform the Government's new agenda as it is pursuing collaboration with civil society. The report clearly identifies primary users and explains how each user is expected to use the evaluation findings and recommendations. The objectives of the evaluation are clearly stated, as are the timeline and geographic scope. The report also specifies that the timeline covered by the evaluation was revised from the timeline originally proposed in the ToRs as the former better aligns with the purpose of the evaluation.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)



Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation uses a strong methodological approach that draws on multiple data sources. The report clearly presents the evaluation's design, methods, data sources and sampling methods and provides an independent justification for their selection. The report also provides a valid explanation as to why the HRBA criterion is addressed, in addition to standard OECD-DAC criteria. Additionally, the report presents the evaluation questions and explains that these have been slightly modified from those proposed in the ToRs following the results of an evaluability assessment. Limitations are also clearly discussed, as are their accompanying mitigation strategies. Finally, the report is strong at describing ethical safeguards and makes explicit reference to UNICEF's International Charter on Ethical Research Involving Children. Ethical obligations of the evaluators are also explicitly mentioned. The annexes include a consent form which explains in plain language data confidentiality and the rights of children in data collection, as well as protocols to report cases of serious harm identified by the evaluators.)

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)



Satisfactory

The report presents robust findings that are triangulated with multiple data sources. Findings are structured around the evaluation questions and sub-questions, which makes it easy for the reader to understand the extent to which evaluation questions were answered. Both positive and negative findings are discussed, as are the key factors enabling or hindering programme effectiveness. Furthermore, the report makes use of the ToC and its results statements to show progression toward the achievement of outputs and outcomes. While the report presents one unintended positive result, it is unclear whether the programme has produced any negative unexpected results. Finally, the report explains that the programme lacks a results framework with baseline, targets, indicators and methods for measuring progress.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)



Highly Satisfactory

Conclusions are strong and provide a thorough overview of the programme's main strengths and weaknesses. The conclusions are clearly linked to the evaluation findings and provide analytical, forward-looking insights that prepare the reader for the recommendations ahead. Lessons learned are insightful and formulated in such a way that they can be applied to other contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)



Highly Satisfactory

Recommendations are logically drawn from the findings and conclusions. They are sufficiently detailed and provide a good explanation of how they can be implemented. Recommendations are also targeted and prioritized. Finally, the report states that recommendations were validated during a workshop attended by UNICEF and key government ministries, therefore reflecting stakeholder involvement. Appendix 8.11 lists the participants and explains how recommendations were revised following the workshop.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)



Satisfactory

The report is logically structured and includes all of the key elements that are expected from a standard evaluation report. The opening pages include key information such as the name of the evaluated object, its timeframe, its geographic location, as well as the name of the commissioning organization and those of the evaluators. Furthermore, the annexes include all of the necessary elements (e.g., ToRs, ToC, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, ethics protocols, etc.) that add significant credibility to the report. However, in the findings section there are limited sub-sections and key finding statements are not easily identified.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)



Highly Satisfactory

The report makes abundant mention of the use of a rights-based framework such as the CRC and CEDAW, and the way that equity and gender equality were included in the design and implementation of the initiative is addressed throughout the report. Also, the report provides a good explanation of the level of involvement of stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation at different stages, which seems aligned with their involvement in the implementation of the initiative. The evaluation also includes an evaluation criterion on cross-cutting issues, including equity and gender equality, and several questions on gender-related issues make part of the evaluation scope of analysis. Furthermore, the methodology made sure that sex-disaggregated data was collected, and several efforts were deployed to ensure the participation of both boys and girls in the evaluation process. Finally, a gender analysis is presented that cascades down through the different sections of the report.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)



Satisfactory

The executive summary includes all of the necessary elements to provide end users with a good understanding of the initiative and of the evaluation. Also, the executive summary only includes information that is further developed in the body of the report. On the other hand, with 13 pages, the executive summary is excessively lengthy and this may hinder its effectiveness in informing high-level users.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

9 Meets requirements

Recommendations for improvement

Lessons for managing future evaluations: The is a very high quality evaluation report that, for the most part, observes good practices and can be used with confidence by decision-makers. It is, however, important that the existence and functions of an Evaluation Reference Group, as stated in the ToRs, be explicitly discussed in the report as this increases the credibility of the evaluation by portraying the participatory nature of the entire process. Also, it is important to emphasize the utility of including an analysis of unintended results or, in the case that none have been observed, it is recommended to explicitly state this in the report. To ensure that both negative and positive unexpected results are clearly discussed, UNICEF could include a question in this regard in the ToRs.

Section A The report could be improved by describing the roles and responsibilities (i.e., technical, financial, etc.) of stakeholders in programme implementation. This could potentially be done using a table format. Also, the specific rights-holder groups and the areas covered by the initiative, (i.e. education, health, social inclusion, etc.), could have been more explicitly described in the report.

Section B This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section C This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section D It is important to ensure that the findings clearly present both positive and negative unexpected results. To ensure that this information is presented, an evaluation question to that effect could be included in the evaluation matrix. Should there be no negative unintended consequences, the report should mention this explicitly.

Section E This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section F This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section G To help the reader to quickly grasp the main findings, the evaluators could add bold statements that provide succinct answers to the evaluation questions. The use of numbered sub-sections would also make the report more reader-friendly.

Section H This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section I It is good practice for the executive summary to not exceed 6 pages so as to effectively inform high-level end users who may not have time to read more than that. The information included in the executive summary needs to, therefore, be further synthesized.
