### Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Pilot/innovation</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Multi-country</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization/business unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Office (Corporate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOA focus area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF/UNEG Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation level</th>
<th>Evaluation design</th>
<th>Evaluation strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation type</th>
<th>Evaluation object</th>
<th>Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</th>
<th>Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</th>
<th>Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</th>
<th>Is the implementation status of the evaluation report clear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta Evaluation</td>
<td>Theory-based</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImpactReady (incl. Merits)</td>
<td>Meta Evaluation</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section A: Background (Weight 5%)

#### Overview

- **Contextual positioning**
  - Description of the context in which the evaluation was conducted, including:
    - **Objectives**: A clear, concise, and focused statement of what the evaluation aimed to achieve.
    - **Background**: The historical, social, economic, and political factors that influenced the context of the intervention.
    - **Scope**: The geographical, temporal, and thematic boundaries of the evaluation.
    - **Purposes**: The specific questions or hypotheses that guided the evaluation.

- **Methodology**
  - Description of the methods and tools used in the evaluation, including:
    - **Data collection**: The techniques used to gather information, such as surveys, interviews, and document reviews.
    - **Data analysis**: The statistical and qualitative methods employed to interpret the data.
    - **Validity and reliability**: The extent to which the evaluation results are accurate and consistent.

- **Findings and recommendations**
  - Summary of the evaluation findings, including:
    - **General findings**: The key outcomes and trends observed in the evaluation.
    - **Implications**: The implications of the findings for policy and practice.
    - **Recommendations**: Specific actions and strategies to address the findings and improve the implementation of the evaluation.

- **Implication for action**
  - Discussion of how the evaluation findings can be used to inform policy, programming, and resource allocation.

### Notes to Reviewers

- Use the template provided to structure your review.
- Please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improvements.
- Ensure that your feedback is constructive and actionable.

**Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention**

- **Clear and relevant description**: The status and needs of the target groups for the implementation of the intervention.
- **Institutional, international factors**: The influence of institutional and international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention.
- **Policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors**: The comprehensive factors impacting the implementation of the intervention.
- **Geographic location(s)**: The specific areas or regions where the intervention was implemented.

**Impact**

- **Partly**
  - Description of the intervention, including:
    - **Location(s)**
    - **Timelines**
    - **Cost/budget**

**Evaluation of the UNICEF Supported Adult Literacy Programme in Guinea Bissau**

- **Contextual, independent, mixed methods**
  - Description of the intervention, including:
    - **Location(s)**
    - **Timelines**
    - **Cost/budget**

**Evaluation Objectives**

- **Impact**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.

**Evaluation**

- **Summative and Satisfactory**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.

**Recommendations**

- **Formative and Meta Evaluation**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.

**Evaluation**

- **Summative and Unsatisfactory**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.

**Evaluation**

- **Summative and Satisfactory**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.

**Evaluation**

- **Summative and Highly Unsatisfactory**
  - Description of intended beneficiaries by type (institutions/organisations, communities, individuals...), by geographic location(s) (urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods), and the provision of specific details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Weighting (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)

- The beginning of the report is unclear. The reader needs more context at the start of the overall findings. There is a need for a more detailed introduction.

### Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)

- The report could benefit from a more structured approach to presenting findings. A summary of the key findings and conclusions should be included at the beginning of the report.

### Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)

- The report's objectives and scope are not clearly defined. The reader needs more information on what the evaluation aims to achieve.

### Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)

- The evaluation framework is not clearly presented near the beginning of the report. More information on the evaluation questions and the evaluation methodology is needed.

### Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)

- The report lacks a clear and complete description of the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. The evaluation questions are not clearly stated.

### Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)

- The report does not provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly connected to the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. The evaluation criteria are not justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation.

### Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)

- The report does not include a clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results. The evaluation framework does not clearly outline the intended outcomes.

### Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section J (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section K (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section L (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section M (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section N (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section O (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section P (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section Q (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section R (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section S (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section T (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section U (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section V (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section W (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section X (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section Y (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.

### Additional comments for Section Z (recommendations for improvement)

- The report fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater will highlight best practices and suggest areas for improvement.
**Executive Feedback on Section C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)**

- Provide additional context and clarify the evaluation objectives and scope.
- Ensure that data collection and analysis methods are well described.

---

**Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)**

- Improve the coherence and flow of the evaluation findings.
- Clarify the presentation of evaluation questions and findings.

---

**Section D: Evaluation Findings (weight 20%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Questions**

1. The conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?
   - Yes

2. Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?
   - No

3. Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantification and explanatory analysis of evidence?
   - Mostly

4. Does the evaluation clearly present multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, impact, intermediate impact, inputs, leading to the findings, and/or of comparison. The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, impact, intermediate impact, inputs, etc.) of comparison?
   - Mostly

5. Are evaluation findings presented in a comprehensive manner and analysis beyond the findings?
   - Mostly

6. Are evaluation findings presented in a comprehensive manner and analysis beyond the findings?
   - Mostly

---

**Additional comments for Section D**

- Provide a clear and comprehensive assessment 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).
- Describe the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if not rated, provide reasons).
- Correctly identify lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be used to improve the intervention.
- Include all the elements described and lacks clarity.
- Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Evaluation Conclusions & Lessons Learned (weight 15%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Executive Feedback on Section E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section E**

- Ensure that the evaluation questions are clear and well-defined.
- Provide evidence to support the evaluation findings.

---

**Additional comments for Section E**

- Improve the coherence and flow of the evaluation findings.
- Clarify the presentation of evaluation questions and findings.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section F**

- Ensure that the evaluation questions are clear and well-defined.
- Provide evidence to support the evaluation findings.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section G**

- Improve the coherence and flow of the evaluation findings.
- Clarify the presentation of evaluation questions and findings.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section H**

- Ensure that the evaluation questions are clear and well-defined.
- Provide evidence to support the evaluation findings.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section I**

- Improve the coherence and flow of the evaluation findings.
- Clarify the presentation of evaluation questions and findings.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section J**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Additional comments for Section J**

- Ensure that the evaluation questions are clear and well-defined.
- Provide evidence to support the evaluation findings.
Executive Feedback on Section G

The section on Lessons Learned in the Evaluation report is not very useful to decision-makers, as they provide concrete suggestions that can be applied in the context of the evaluation.

Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be implemented.

Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)

- Clear prioritisation and/or classification of recommendations to support use
- Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)
- Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the criteria for prioritisation leads to the findings, and/or of the relevance and feasibility of the recommendations and/or of the reasons for prioritisation
- Recommendation implementation and results of the recommendations are evaluated and summarised
- Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the criteria for prioritisation leads to the findings, and/or of the relevance and feasibility of the recommendations and/or of the reasons for prioritisation
- Recommendation implementation and results of the recommendations are evaluated and summarised

Executive Feedback on Section G

The section on Lessons Learned in the Evaluation report is not very useful to decision-makers, as they provide concrete suggestions that can be applied in the context of the evaluation. Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be implemented.
### Section II: Evaluation Principles (weight 15%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Feedback on Section II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional comments for Section II (recommendations for improvement)

- These comments should be designed to provide relevant feedback and the data collected...

---

### Section III: Evaluation Summary (weight 50%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Feedback on Section III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional comments for Section III (recommendations for improvement)

- These comments should be designed to provide relevant feedback and the data collected...

---

### Section IV: Recommendations (weight 35%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Rubric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Feedback on Section IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional comments for Section IV (recommendations for improvement)

- These comments should be designed to provide relevant feedback and the data collected...
The Executive Summary should be lengthened to include information on the programme and on the evaluation (including purpose, objectives, and methodology).