

Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation	Evaluation of the Multilingual Education Component of the Unity in Diversity Project in Kyrgyzstan
Sequence No	2016/004
Region	CEE/CIS
Office	Rep of Kyrgyzstan
Coverage	Rep of Kyrgyzstan
Evaluation Type	Country Programme
Year of Report	2016

OVERALL RATING	
	Satisfactory Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
Implications: Lessons for future evaluations:	It is essential that the report should be seen to have utilized all the qualitative and quantitative data collected through detailed analysis of the evidence.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

	Satisfactory The Evaluation object has been described clearly with objectives and relevance of the program. The context of the intervention has been well presented. Risk factors of the programme well articulated. Programme logic and a brief ToC has been given as specified in the ToRs. This could have been developed further. Programme budget and contributions of UNICEF and OHCHR_ROCA are given in Table 8 under Findings, but the overall amounts could have been mentioned in description of the intervention.
---	--

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

	Satisfactory The section has been well written. The challenge in terms of language has been indicated. Primary and secondary users of the report could be identified for better utilisation of the report
---	---

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

	Satisfactory Methodology for the evaluation has been explained. The evaluation methodology is generally as per ToRs and is stated to be according to UNICEF standard criteria. OECD-DAC evaluation criteria have been adopted. While it has been mentioned that data from various sources would be triangulated, specificity in the statement could have added value to the report. The lists of participants in the evaluation interviews and FGDs have been annexed. They could have been gender segregated. While there is a mention of ethical standards being followed, there is no specific indication how they are followed in practice
---	--

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

	Fair The findings seem to be based on conclusions from FGDs and other stakeholder interviews. As a large number of stakeholders of different groups seem to have been covered in the evaluation, it would have made the evidence more credible if frequencies of different responses of the stakeholders were presented where appropriate and possible. The findings do not make a mention of the Monitoring system of the programme. Perhaps there is none.
---	--

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

• • - -

Fair

Lessons learnt and conclusions are clearly stated and are based on evaluation findings. However, the conclusions, placed in the report after the recommendations and lessons learnt are general. The section appears to be more generic

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

• • • -

Satisfactory

The recommendations seem to be directly based on findings and have been neatly presented according to evaluation criteria, time-frame, and priority, indicating the organizations responsible.

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

• • • -

Satisfactory

The structure of the report is generally logical. Conclusions could have come before Recommendations. Annexes could have included information on the evaluators.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

• • - -

Fair

The ToRs call for covering equity and gender aspects in the evaluation. These aspects have been covered under Finding 4 in Section 4.1. However, there is not much evidence of gender and equity segregated data and analysis of results.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

• • • -

Satisfactory

Executive summary has been well written indicating all the relevant points. It is well structured and logical.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

5

Approaches requirements

Recommendations for improvement

Section A Generally satisfactorily presented.

Section B The section generally meets the quality requirements

Section C The report would benefit from providing specific details on how the referenced ethics standards were applied.

Section D UNICEF evaluations are expected to assess the extent to which a Results Based Management system was established and used to improve performance.

Section E Conclusions should have been more specific abstractions from the findings and should have been placed before recommendations.

Section F This section makes specific recommendations and is well-presented. It would have been more logical to link the recommendations to the conclusions.

Section G Conclusions should come after findings but before recommendations.

Section H Gender and equity aspects should have been mainstreamed across the whole range of data collection tools, analyses, and recommendations.

Section I Findings and recommendations have been neatly summarized. Only Conclusions could have come before recommendations.