# Executive Feedback
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation of the UNICEF Supported Adult Literacy Programme in Guinea Bissau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence No</td>
<td>2016/001</td>
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## OVERALL RATING
- Fair

### SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)
- Fair

Information on the programme (such as timeline, costs, and implementation status) is mentioned sporadically throughout the report but is not clearly presented near the beginning of the report, making it somewhat difficult for the reader. Unfortunately no contextual information is provided within the report (although links to country statistics are provided in a footnote on p. 36) and the needs of the target beneficiaries are not clearly identified. While the programme is designed to increase the literacy of its participants, the report does not identify the participants’ levels of educational achievement prior to enrolling in the programme. The evaluator reconstructed a Theory of Change Model, which was then well used to report on results in the findings section. While programme partners, duty bearers, and rights holders are well identified, the specific contributions in terms of financial contributions and technical support provided by UNICEF is unclear.

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

The report specifies that the evaluation will be used by UNICEF to decide whether further funding or scaling-up of the programme will be supported by the organisation. Recommendations for scalability are key to the report and are provided from pp. 35 - 37. However, other evaluation objectives are not identified and no reference is made to the ToRs (which are not included in the report). The report specifies that 10 learning centers were included in the scope of the evaluation. However, no other references to scope (including the reasons for the scope) are provided.

### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)
- Fair
The evaluation follows standard OECD/DAC criteria but while evaluation questions are presented, they are not clearly categorized per evaluation criterion. The report explains that a mixed methods approach was used and that information gathered was assessed using triangulation. While data sources are identified on p. 8, there is no list of interviewees provided as an appendix. The rationale and sampling strategy for these data sources is not mentioned. While evaluation limitations are identified, the implications of these limitations are not discussed and mitigation strategies are not presented. Ethical issues surrounding the evaluator's behaviour are not mentioned but ethics around confidentiality, anonymity, and confidentiality are discussed.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory

Findings are clearly presented around outcomes identified in the evaluator's reconstructed Theory of Change Model and evaluation criteria. They are based on sufficient levels of evidence and are strong at describing causal factors. The cost analysis is a particularly strong point within the evaluation, providing an assessment on the programme's economy, effectiveness, and efficiency in terms of value for money. The programme's M&E system is well assessed with the conclusion that very limited information was gathered or used to inform decision-making. While the evaluation does use multiple lines of evidence (including pass rates), it does not specifically identify the educational levels of participants before entering into the programme, making it more difficult to clearly assess participants' progress made during the programme. Several unexpected findings are discussed (such as parents' attitudes towards their children's education) but they are not clearly identified as unexpected findings.

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

Fair

Conclusions are well written; identify both strengths and weaknesses; are appropriately derived from the findings; and add important analysis that goes beyond the findings. Implications are discussed in the section on sustainability and scaling-up on pp. 35 - 37. While a section on Lessons Learned is presented on pp. 34 and 35, lessons learned are not correctly identified and do not contain an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Fair

Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be very useful to decision-makers, as they provide concrete suggestions that can be applied in the particular programming context. Most but not all of the recommendations explicitly identify the target group for action. Unfortunately, the recommendations are simply listed with no prioritisation. The report does not discuss stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process and no reference is made to how recommendations were developed and whether stakeholders were involved in the process.

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

Fair
All of the necessary basic information is included in the opening pages. Annexes are provided but do not include all of the necessary information (i.e. the ToRs, list of interviewees, evaluation matrix, and list of documentary evidence are not included) and the links included in the annexes provided could not be opened by the reviewer. Although the report structure is generally easy to navigate with clearly identified sections that logically lead from one to another, information on the programme itself is sporadically included throughout the report rather than presented in a clearly identified section near the beginning of the report.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

**Unsatisfactory**

The evaluation is strong at presenting disaggregated data by sex throughout the report and at assessing the benefits that the programme has had on women. However, even though women were included as interviewees, there are no evaluation questions specifically designed to collect gender-sensitive information and it is impossible to determine whether the data collection tools are gender-sensitive since they were not accessible in the annexes. Apart from gender mainstreaming, other cross-cutting issues such as human rights and equity are not explicitly touched upon. There is no differentiation in the evaluation regarding socio-economic differences between programme participants. Surprisingly, the methodology did not include any interviews with the programme stakeholders at the government or UNICEF levels, who are the duty bearers.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

**Fair**

The Executive Summary is concisely written and highlights the most important elements of the Final Report. It is, however, quite short at only 1 page and does not include all of the elements that would normally be mentioned within the Executive Summary (such as an overview of the programme and information on the evaluation itself).

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 6 | Approaches requirements |

Recommendations for improvement

**Section A**

A brief summary of the programme and the context in which it operates would be useful near the beginning of the report to help the reader make sense of the subsequent findings. The report would also be stronger if the educational level of participants before entering the programme was identified so that a tangible comparison between pre-and post-programme results could be made (this would be in addition to the passing rates, which were used by the evaluator to assess student progress). Additionally, the report should clearly identify the financial contributions made by UNICEF as well as the technical support provided.

**Section B**

The ToRs should be included as an appendix to the report and any deviations away from the ToRs should be highlighted and discussed within the report. Additionally, the evaluation scope should be described in greater detail, including what was and was not covered by the evaluation and why.
| Section C | Evaluation questions would be clearer and easier to refer to if they were presented around each evaluation criterion. While the report does a good job at identifying data sources, it would be even stronger if it provided a list of interviewees as an appendix. Additionally, the rationale and the sampling strategy for these data sources must be discussed. While it is good that evaluation limitations are presented, the report would be stronger and more credible if the implications of these limitations were discussed and mitigation strategies were presented. The report also needs to provide more information on the ethics guiding the evaluator's behaviour and safeguards used when interacting with informants. |
| Section D | The indicators of student performance would be stronger if the evaluator did not only use passing rates to assess educational performance but also compared the educational attainment of students at the end of the programme to their pre-programme levels. While it is excellent that unexpected findings are discussed so thoroughly within the report, they should be clearly identified as such. |
| Section E | Lessons learned should present information learned from the particular programme under review that could be used or applied to other similar scenarios. |
| Section F | All of the recommendations should explicitly identify the target group for action, even if the target group seems obvious to the evaluator. Additionally, recommendations should be listed in a prioritised fashion so that the target group for action understands which recommendations are most urgent. Stakeholders should ideally be included in the process of developing recommendations and this process should be described in the report. |
| Section G | The annexes should include more information (such as the ToRs, a list of interviewees, an evaluation matrix, and a list of documentary evidence) and should not include links that are difficult or impossible to open. Basic information on the programme (including timeframe, implementation status, purpose, and costs) should be presented near the beginning of the report in order to facilitate the reader's understanding of the report. |
| Section H | In order to completely mainstream gender throughout the evaluation process, some evaluation questions should be designed to gather gender-sensitive information and the data collection tools should also be designed to facilitate the collection of gender-sensitive information. Other cross-cutting issues such as human rights and equity should also be mainstreamed through the evaluation. For instance, the report could use more explicit human rights language and include duty bearers as sources of information. Additionally, differences between participants' socio-economic situations could be taken into consideration when developing the findings. |
| Section I | The Executive Summary should be lengthened to include information on the programme and on the evaluation (including purpose, objectives, and methodology). |