## UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colours Coding</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Dark Green</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section &amp; Overall Rating</td>
<td>Outstanding, best practice</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections.

### UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System

- **UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards**
- **UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System**

### UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Coding</th>
<th>Classification of Evaluation Report</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of Meena Radio Programme</td>
<td>The project began in one state and expanded to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of Meena Radio Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of Meena Radio Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geographic Scope

- **Sub-national**: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country

### Management of Evaluation

- **UNICEF managed**: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.

### Purpose

- **Project**: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes

### Result

- **Outcome**: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme

### SPOA Correspondence

- **Education**: Supporting global efforts to provide access to quality education for both boys and girls through improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education.
  - Programme areas:
    - Early learning
    - Equity with a focus on girls’ education and inclusive education
    - Learning and child friendly schools
    - Education in humanitarian situations

### Level of Independence

- **Independent external**: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.

### Approach

- **Formative**: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme.
**SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>The object of the evaluation is described at length. The explanation of context includes relevant information related to the project. The findings relate to the project’s goals and how they aim to change the broader context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks &amp; priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does this illuminate findings?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also includes impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>The Theory of Change was included as an Annex to the TORs rather than being included in the body of the report. It lists inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact-level results, and illustrates the causal links between each results level. Four outputs, one outcome, and one impact are however not linked to any lower level results. There is thus a lack of clarity in the results chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Many references are made to the stakeholders that will be engaged during the evaluation but there is no clear list of key stakeholders other than the naming of the State Education authorities in each of the 3 States. UNICEF’s contributions to budget and support of the project is clearly defined in different places namely, through the illustration on p. 15 describing UNICEF’s and the government’s respective roles in the implementation of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are key stakeholders’ contributions described?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are UNICEF contributions described?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the implementation status described?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>The scaling up of this project to two additional states was described well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

- Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

- The object of the evaluation was described thoroughly and the context included relevant information. The inclusion of a theory of change was positive but causal linkages between some results are missing. The role and contribution of government and UNICEF were clearly illustrated in a graph included in the Executive Summary. The implementation status was also clearly described.

- While the results chain is illustrated in an annex, it could have been explained more clearly. For example, the reason why some outputs, outcome and impact are not linked to any lower level results could have been explained to make the logic clearer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? (cc)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Information on the purpose is provided. The section on ‘objectives of the evaluation’ presents the evaluation criteria, along with an explanation of what the evaluation is seeking to achieve. The purpose of the evaluation was clarified, but the objectives and scope were not clearly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? (cc)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The purpose was described in a succinct manner and the evaluation framework was clear in its presentation of the criteria to be used in this evaluation. However, the objectives and scope of the evaluation were not clearly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do the objectives and scope relate to the purpose? (cc)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The purpose was described in a succinct manner and the evaluation framework was clear in its presentation of the criteria to be used in this evaluation. However, the objectives and scope of the evaluation were not clearly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? (cc)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report clearly lists the evaluation criteria to be used and makes reference to UNEG and OECD-DAC standards. The report also mentions that the evaluation will focus on gender and equity. The description of the scope of the evaluation is not complete as the report only refers to the evaluation focusing on three states, but the time period is not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? (cc)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The purpose was described in a succinct manner and the evaluation framework was clear in its presentation of the criteria to be used in this evaluation. However, the objectives and scope of the evaluation were not clearly identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section B**

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating: Up to two comments.

Whereas the purpose of the evaluation is presented, the objectives and scope are not clearly articulated. The choice of evaluation criteria is presented and justified.
### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report provides considerable detail on the various data collection methods and sources to be used, as well as the rationale for selecting them. There is a clear attention to the need for triangulation, and a discussion of data limits. Reference is made to the need for pre-post comparisons based on data from Uttar Pradesh in the TORs, which is mentioned in the effectiveness section of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The evaluation report refers to the ethical considerations made: providing a detailed discussion of the purpose and method to all participants, giving them the opportunity to refuse to be part of the evaluation, obtaining their consent prior to their participation, keeping their identity confidential, and making sure there was no conflict of interest during the evaluation process. There was no discussion of safeguards per se, which could have been appropriate given the use of focus group discussions and the fact that some radio show topics are culturally sensitive. Obtaining informed consent is however an ethical safeguard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The evaluation report refers to ethical considerations made: providing a detailed discussion of the purpose and method to all participants, giving them the opportunity to refuse to be part of the evaluation, obtaining their consent prior to their participation, keeping their identity confidential, and making sure there was no conflict of interest during the evaluation process. There was no discussion of safeguards per se, which could have been appropriate given the use of focus group discussions and the fact that some radio show topics are culturally sensitive. Obtaining informed consent is however an ethical safeguard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Constructive feedback for future reports

- **Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice**
  - There could have been a clear reference to a human rights based approach in this evaluation and approaches defined accordingly. However, HRAp was not explicit in the TORs so it was missing from the outset but the evaluators could have introduced it themselves. More attention could have been given to gender equality and equity at all stages of the evaluation context, design, sampling, data collection methods, data analysis, findings and recommendations, disaggregating interviewees and focus group participants by gender and age. Ethical considerations were taken into account. There was a lack of
23. Does the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?

The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should be consistent with the programme's goals and objectives. However, there was a lack of attention to assessing the relevance of gender equality, and to equity. The evaluation report makes several references to gender equality concerns, which is the only cross-cutting theme mentioned as being specifically considered in the evaluation. However, these issues could have been more fully integrated into the evaluation process. There was an absence of references to human rights based approaches in the assessment of key stakeholders (e.g., duty bearers and rights holders), the evaluation approach, questions or methods. Child rights are mentioned in the report but it is in reference to the project content rather than in the evaluation itself. There is an absence of references to the monitoring framework and any attention to human rights in the monitoring process. There was some attention paid to assessing the relevance of the radio programmes from a gender perspective, which included questions being asked of and about boys and girls. However, almost no references were made to gender disaggregated data in the report. Evaluation recommendations include increasing the focus on gender but this is one among 15 recommendations.

24. Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?

The evaluation report makes several references to ‘gender and equity concerns’, which is the only cross-cutting theme mentioned as being specifically considered in the evaluation. However, these issues could have been more fully integrated into the evaluation. There was an absence of references to human rights based approaches in the assessment of key stakeholders (e.g., duty bearers and rights holders), the evaluation approach, questions or methods. Child rights are mentioned in the report but it is in reference to the project content rather than in the evaluation itself. There is an absence of references to the monitoring framework and any attention to human rights in the monitoring process. There was some attention paid to assessing the relevance of the radio programmes from a gender perspective, which included questions being asked of and about boys and girls. However, almost no references were made to gender disaggregated data in the report. Evaluation recommendations include increasing the focus on gender but this is one among 15 recommendations.
### Executive Feedback on Section C

A HRBAP approach should have been introduced in the TORs and then followed through the evaluation. Methods whereby causality can be assessed and attributed are needed, otherwise, limitations should explain more clearly why causality could not be assessed.

### Stakeholder participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Rules for participation might include: ◦ Liaisons ◦ Technical advisory ◦ Observer ◦ Active decision making. The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The breadth &amp; degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible &amp; preferable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodological robustness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution attribution?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations must be specifically recognized and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the method of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The TORs explicitly request that a pre-post comparison be done using the baseline and end-line data from Uttara Pradesh, which is slightly discussed under effectiveness. The evaluators identify the impossibility of having a counterfactual (due to the fact that the project is implemented in all districts in the states) as a limitation of the evaluation. The evaluators acknowledges that the evaluation cannot draw direct causal linkages. It can only demonstrate contributions and not attributions, and specifies that an "attributional bias to the Meena Radio Programme for changes in awareness cannot be ruled out." (p. 29) It is not clear how this bias was addressed. The report does not specify how the evaluators attempted to mitigate the limitations identified, but it mentions the use of data triangulation. Overall, the methodology used was appropriate to answer the evaluation questions.
Yes
Yes
Mostly
Yes
N/A
Yes
There was an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of this project in each of the 3 states. Consideration was given to comparing this project to others similar but there was a lack of suitable comparators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>completeness and logic of findings</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</td>
<td>The findings are clearly presented both in narrative and summary form, and address all the evaluation's stated criteria. They are based on the use of reported evidence. Information on the secondary sources used is provided. Limitations are enumerated in a specific section, and examples of limitations are also described in the report. Unexpected findings were not mentioned and do not seem to apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</td>
<td>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</td>
<td>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</td>
<td>The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</td>
<td>There was an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of this project in each of the 3 states. Consideration was given to comparing this project to others similar but there was a lack of suitable comparators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

Implementing a rigorous contribution analysis is needed in order to assess causality. This is particularly needed when claims of behaviour change are being made.
Contribution and causality

36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?

Overall, the report is careful in attributing results to the project and prefers to refer to contributions. It identifies stakeholders that have contributed to results. Perceptions from focus groups were taken as evidence that a change could be attributed to this radio project (though triangulation with secondary data sources was used when possible). The limitation section of the report mentions that direct causal links cannot be drawn.

37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?

These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust.

(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)

38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?

The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.

39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?

Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.

40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?

Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.

41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?

As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.

Strengths, weaknesses and implications

42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?

The conclusions summarise the findings to a certain extent rather than departing from the findings in a significant way. Some of the conclusions make reference to stakeholders views.

Completeness and insight of conclusions

43 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?

Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessible, adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).

Executive Feedback on Section D

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

Up to two sentences

Findings are clearly presented and they are based on the use of reported evidence. Conclusions summarise the findings well, but add limited value.

The report is careful in attributing results to the project and prefers to refer to contributions. Conclusions summarise the findings well, but add limited value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</th>
<th>Usefulness of recommendations</th>
<th>Appropriateness of lessons learned</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations are clearly linked to the findings and conclusions. They are fairly well-grounded in the evidence but comments made on the quality of the evidence should be considered. The recommendations are relevant to the object but could have benefited from prioritisation.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations were clearly presented but could have been prioritised so as to increase their utility. Lessons learned should be clearly expressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations identify who should take ownership and are organised well according to institutional/policy and operational levels. They are then sub-divided according to different categories. This renders them easy to interpret but they are still numerous and it would be difficult for UNICEF or the government to know which elements were keys to successful or improved implementation. There is a brief discussion of the process undertaken to develop the recommendations, but no indication of stakeholders’ participation in this process.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>A clear presentation of lessons learned is required to complement conclusions and prior to the recommendations. These have a specific purpose and are useful in presenting aspects of the evaluation that can apply to contexts and situations outside the evaluated object. Information on whether or not the recommendations were prepared in a participatory manner is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for action. Because of the large number of recommendations the prioritisation might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic. The recommendations include a clear and relevant understanding of the implementation constraints and an understanding of the follow-up processes.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations identify who should take ownership and are organised well according to institutional/policy and operational levels. They are then sub-divided according to different categories. This renders them easy to interpret but they are still numerous and it would be difficult for UNICEF or the government to know which elements were keys to successful or improved implementation. There is a brief discussion of the process undertaken to develop the recommendations, but no indication of stakeholders’ participation in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations identify who should take ownership and are organised well according to institutional/policy and operational levels. They are then sub-divided according to different categories. This renders them easy to interpret but they are still numerous and it would be difficult for UNICEF or the government to know which elements were keys to successful or improved implementation. There is a brief discussion of the process undertaken to develop the recommendations, but no indication of stakeholders’ participation in this process.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations were clearly presented but could have been prioritised so as to increase their utility. Lessons learned should be clearly expressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations identify who should take ownership and are organised well according to institutional/policy and operational levels. They are then sub-divided according to different categories. This renders them easy to interpret but they are still numerous and it would be difficult for UNICEF or the government to know which elements were keys to successful or improved implementation. There is a brief discussion of the process undertaken to develop the recommendations, but no indication of stakeholders’ participation in this process.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>A clear presentation of lessons learned is required to complement conclusions and prior to the recommendations. These have a specific purpose and are useful in presenting aspects of the evaluation that can apply to contexts and situations outside the evaluated object. Information on whether or not the recommendations were prepared in a participatory manner is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations identify who should take ownership and are organised well according to institutional/policy and operational levels. They are then sub-divided according to different categories. This renders them easy to interpret but they are still numerous and it would be difficult for UNICEF or the government to know which elements were keys to successful or improved implementation. There is a brief discussion of the process undertaken to develop the recommendations, but no indication of stakeholders’ participation in this process.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The recommendations were clearly presented but could have been prioritised so as to increase their utility. Lessons learned should be clearly expressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>Whereas ‘lessons learnt’ are included in the title of the final chapter along with conclusions and recommendations, the lessons are presented as ‘Conclusions and Learnings from the Evaluation of the Meena Radio Programme’. Lessons are not presented separately.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>A clear presentation of lessons learned is required to complement conclusions and prior to the recommendations. These have a specific purpose and are useful in presenting aspects of the evaluation that can apply to contexts and situations outside the evaluated object. Information on whether or not the recommendations were prepared in a participatory manner is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</td>
<td>Mostly Yes</td>
<td>Whereas ‘lessons learnt’ are included in the title of the final chapter along with conclusions and recommendations, the lessons are presented as ‘Conclusions and Learnings from the Evaluation of the Meena Radio Programme’. Lessons are not presented separately.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>A clear presentation of lessons learned is required to complement conclusions and prior to the recommendations. These have a specific purpose and are useful in presenting aspects of the evaluation that can apply to contexts and situations outside the evaluated object. Information on whether or not the recommendations were prepared in a participatory manner is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section E**

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. 3-5 to two sentences.
**SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</strong> Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including titles, graphs, figures and annexes; List of acronyms</td>
<td>Mostly yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52. Is the report logically structured?</strong> Correct, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons learnt.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53. Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</strong> Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of Interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54. Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Summary</strong></td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</strong> If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</strong> Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57. Can the executive summary stand alone?</strong> It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58. Can the executive summary inform decision making?</strong> It should be short (desirably 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlighting key priorities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section F** Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. Up to two sentences

The report was well-structured and logical. The Executive Summary can stand alone for decision-making purposes.

**Additional Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</strong> The TORs were included in the report. The scope of the evaluation is clearly described in the TORs but this was not picked up in the main report. Similarly, references were made to the use of pre-post comparison of data from a mid-term and end-line study that were mentioned only once in the evaluation report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation in terms of evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation in terms of programme, sector specific, thematic expertise</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.

Including a Glossary of Terms is a useful addition alongside the List of Acronyms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>What is the contribution of each of the five core evaluation elements separately? Is it particularly important to consider? Is the report methodologically appropriate? Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? Is the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations held together?</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The evaluation report was clearly presented. There was a considerable amount of evidence gathered but the evaluation specifies that it cannot make attribution claims, despite using secondary data to corroborate findings from primary data whenever possible. Keeping in mind the limitations, the evaluation is sufficiently credible. However, the reasons for not including counter-factual and causality analysis in the evaluation methodology could have been clearer.</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td>This report does address the purpose and objectives of the evaluation with clarity. Primary source data (interview, focus groups) was used to inform findings, which were validated by secondary source data whenever possible. The report carefully highlights that attributions cannot be made and that it can only demonstrate contributions that the project had in influencing knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of students. The identification of conclusions and recommendations by owner was well done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</strong>&lt;br&gt;The report should hold together not just as individually appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical whole.</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</strong>&lt;br&gt;This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Overall Rating**<br>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.<br>Up to two sentences

Despite attention being paid to gathering primary source data and triangulating with secondary sources, the methodology does not allow to make claims of attribution and establish direct causal linkages, which is acknowledged as a limitation. The report clearly mentions that it demonstrates contributions to results, but the justification for the absence of counter-factual and causality analysis is not entirely clear.