

# Executive Feedback

<b>Title of the evaluation</b>	<b>Evaluation of the Pilot MEND and RISE Cash Transfer Programmes in St. Kitts and Nevis</b>
<b>Sequence No</b>	2018/001
<b>Region</b>	LACR
<b>Office</b>	Barbados
<b>Coverage</b>	Barbados
<b>Evaluation Type</b>	Pilot/innovation
<b>Year of Report</b>	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%)



**Highly Satisfactory**

The report presents a thorough description of the sociopolitical context and the way it relates to the initiative. Similarly, the report clearly explains the object of the evaluation, including time and location, current status of the programme, primary beneficiaries as well as their main characteristics and needs. Furthermore, the report discusses the importance that the intervention has for UNICEF. A Theory of Change is discussed in detail and a graphic representation is presented. Finally, main stakeholders, their respective roles and contributions, along with their participation level in the evaluation process are duly discussed and presented in Table 4.

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



**Satisfactory**

The purpose of the evaluation is clearly presented and appears realistic. Additionally, the report clearly indicates the evaluation's intended users. On the other hand, even if the report discusses the evaluation's main focus, it lacks detail around the scope of the evaluation in terms of time period and geographical coverage.

## SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)



**Satisfactory**

The report presents a good discussion around the evaluation framework and the selection of evaluation criteria, which are aligned with the OECD/DAC standard criteria. The evaluation also includes cross-cutting principles of gender equality, equity and human rights according to the UNEG's Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The report also presents the methods of analysis used along with an explanation of how triangulation was conducted among different levels of evidence. Also, a detailed evaluation matrix with specific evaluation questions is presented as well as the limitations faced by the evaluation and some mitigation strategies. Finally, the evaluation does a good job at discussing ethical safeguards used to protect participants, including a discussion around the way UNICEF procedures for ethical research involving children were implemented. However, even if the report explains that evaluators employed a gender-sensitive approach that recognized the unique roles held by women and girls in creating social change, other ethical obligations of the evaluators are not discussed.

---

#### SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)



##### **Highly Satisfactory**

Findings follow the evaluation framework, respond to key evaluation questions, and make reference to outputs, short-term and long-term outcomes and impact. The evaluation addresses both positive and negative findings and they are supported by several lines of evidence providing causal factors that explain success or failure. Similarly, as per the ToRs, the evaluation report discusses the initiative's M&E system and the way this system was used during the implementation period, along with ways to improve it. Also, the report duly discusses the occurrence of unintended results and it explains that even if there were none, some results had higher importance than anticipated.

---

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



##### **Highly Satisfactory**

Conclusions provide further insight into the information presented in the findings and they provide a discussion around the challenges that may lie ahead if the pilot programme is scaled-up. Furthermore, lessons learned are correctly identified and duly generalized so as to maximize their usefulness in other contexts.

---

#### SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)



##### **Highly Satisfactory**

Recommendations stem logically from the findings and conclusions and clearly indicate the target stakeholders for action in each case. Recommendations are clearly classified in a table format and cover programme areas, provide orders of priority and a rationale. Finally, the report duly describes the process followed in developing the recommendations and the participation of key stakeholders in this process.

---

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



##### **Satisfactory**

The opening pages of the report include all necessary information in order to quickly grasp the essential elements of the intervention and the evaluation. Similarly, the annexes include valuable information such as methodological tools, the ToRs, the evaluators' biography, list of interviewees, etc. Finally, the evaluation report is easy to navigate, with clearly numbered sections and sub-sections following a logical structure. This being said, the evaluation report is too long (at 120 pages).

---

**SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)**



**Satisfactory**

The report uses human rights, equity, and gender sensitive language. It makes explicit reference to human rights obligations and standards, and breaks down rights holders per equity group. The report is strong at identifying stakeholders and at discussing their roles in the initiative as well as in the evaluation. However, stakeholder participation in the evaluation may have been even greater had the evaluation manager formed an Evaluation Reference Group made up of key stakeholders to help guide and manage the evaluation process. The evaluation made a strong attempt to address and mainstream gender equality. GEEW is mainstreamed through most (but not all) of the evaluation criteria and questions and is mentioned throughout the evaluation findings and recommendations. However, there remains room for the evaluation to have executed an even stronger gender focus.

---

**SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)**



**Satisfactory**

The executive summary provides all of the necessary elements to allow for a thorough understanding of both the initiative as well as the evaluation. However, the executive summary is excessively lengthy (12 pages) and should be further synthesized to 4-5 pages to be useful to decision-makers. Finally, all elements addressed in the executive summary are discussed in further detail in the body of the report.

---

**Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?**

6 Approaches requirements

---

**Recommendations for improvement**

This is a strong evaluation report that is based on a good methodology and that presents very robust and well written findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The report made a good attempt at integrating and mainstreaming gender equality and at using a participatory approach. However, the evaluation could have been even more participatory had the evaluation manager set up an Evaluation Reference Group made up of key stakeholders to help guide and manage the evaluation. Also, there is room to more thoroughly address GEEW throughout the evaluation process and report. In the future, it would be good for the evaluation manager to specify that the report should be no longer than 80 pages to ensure that it is accessible and can be easily used by stakeholders.

**Lessons for managing future evaluations:**

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

---

Section B	It is important that the subsection dedicated to discussing the scope of the evaluation clearly addresses what is to be covered by the evaluation in chronological and geographic terms. Furthermore, the report should discuss what (if anything) was left out of the evaluation scope and provide a rationale for this.
Section C	It is recommended to explicitly address the obligations of the evaluators regarding their independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, and accountability, as per UNEG's Norms and Standards. For more information on this, please visit <a href="http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914">http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914</a>
Section D	This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
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	This section generally observes good practices. However, the evaluation report is excessively long (at 120 pages) and could be shortened, for example, by annexing some information such as the evaluation matrix or the Theory of Change, etc. It is essential that the report be an accessible length to be useful to stakeholders (around 60 - 80 pages).
Section H	Stakeholder participation in the evaluation may have been even greater had the evaluation manager formed an Evaluation Reference Group made up of key stakeholders to help guide and manage the evaluation process. To learn more about conducting participatory evaluations, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/participatory_evaluation">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/participatory_evaluation</a> . There is also room for the evaluation to have used a stronger GEEW focus. For instance, GEEW could have been better mainstreamed through all of the evaluation questions and criteria by identifying stakeholders by sex. Another way of strengthening GEEW considerations could have been to use a specific gender equality evaluation criterion in the evaluation matrix. This would likely have helped strengthen the report's mainstreaming of GEEW throughout the findings and recommendations. Finally, it would have been useful to the reader to understand exactly how a gender-sensitive approach was used within the evaluation methodology. To learn more about how to conduct gender sensitive evaluations, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook</a> .
Section I	The executive summary for the most part observes good practices. It is recommended that it be shortened to 4-5 pages in order to successfully and succinctly inform end-users.