

Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation	Evaluation of Adolescent Life Skills Education Programme in Maharashtra
Sequence No	2018/010
Region	ROSA
Office	India
Coverage	India

Evaluation Type Programme

Year of Report 2018

OVERALL RATING



Satisfactory

Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may

Implications: use the evaluation with confidence

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)



Highly Satisfactory

The report does a good job at clearly describing the object of the evaluation as well as the country's economic, social and political context surrounding the implementation of the programme. The importance of the programme within the work done by UNICEF in India and globally in the area of LSE is also discussed in detail and the roles and responsibilities of UNICEF and the other key stakeholders in the implementation of the object of the evaluation are duly explained. The intended results of the programme are clearly outlined in the report and the evaluators reconstructed a Theory of Change that was validated by all relevant stakeholders.

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



Highly Satisfactory

The report clearly states the purpose of the evaluation as assessing the LSE programme implemented from April 2014 to March 2016 in selected schools of Chandrapur district in Maharashtra and to understand the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme. The intended use of the evaluation is described as informing UNICEF and the Government of Maharashtra, specifically the Education Department, of key issues that need to be considered in the programming of LSE in secondary schools. Similarly, the report does a good job at describing what the evaluation intended to accomplish and at explaining its geographic and time period coverage.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)



Satisfactory

The report presents a complete description of the evaluation framework, including a discussion around the evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions. An evaluation matrix is presented in annex B. However, even though the evaluation mentions that the impact criterion was discarded from the framework, it does not discuss the rationale for this. Conversely, the report does a good job at describing the evaluation design and methodological approach and discusses in detail the data collection methods and tools as well as data analysis methods. Furthermore, the report discusses the sampling techniques used in every case and provides a rationale for the choices made in this regard. Similarly, methodological limitations are presented along with mitigation strategies proposed. Ethical safeguards, including UNICEF ethical procedures for research involving children, are described. However, the report does not discuss the ethical obligations of the evaluators.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)



Satisfactory

The report presents findings that are based on several levels of evidence and address both successes of the implementation as well as areas for improvement. Findings are clearly presented making reference to the initiative's logical results framework and address the evaluation criteria that guided the evaluation process. The report addresses the causal factors for successes and shortcomings and also presents an analysis of unintended outcomes. Finally, the report provides an assessment of the LSE initiative's M&E system which is described as largely absent and recommendations are provided on how to strengthen this aspect of the initiative. On the other hand, even if the evaluation includes questions on unexpected positive and negative effects of the initiative, only the former are discussed.

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



Highly Satisfactory

The report presents conclusions that are forward-looking and that are correctly drawn from the information presented in the findings section. Conclusions are balanced as they highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the initiative and are conveniently presented according to the evaluation criteria. Finally, the evaluation correctly identifies lessons learned and presents them in a way that ensures their wider relevance and usefulness for similar initiatives in other contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)



Satisfactory

The report presents recommendations that are useful to end users as they clearly specify the target group for action in each case as well as the area to which the recommendations belong, (i.e. capacity-building, social norm, advocacy, etc.). Also, the report provides recommendations on the prospects for scale-up and on ways to improve the M&E system of the initiative in the future. Conversely, the report does not discuss the process through which the recommendations were developed or the level of stakeholder involvement in this process.

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



Highly Satisfactory

The report follows a particularly clear structure, uses straightforward and simple language, and facilitates a very easy read. All of the sections of the report are presented in the standard order for this type of evaluation. The opening pages contain all necessary elements to readily inform the reader about the object of the evaluation, the time period and geographic scope covered, the commissioning organisation, the evaluation team, etc. Furthermore, the annexes are complete, i.e. including the ToRs, the evaluation matrix, additional information on methodological tools, etc.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)



Satisfactory

The evaluation does a good job at making reference to the usage of a rights-based approach in the design and implementation of the intervention as well as the place that equity and gender-equality occupied within these. Whereas the evaluation provides in general a good account of the ways that stakeholders participated in both the intervention and the evaluation process, there is no reference to the way they participated in developing the recommendations. Finally, while the evaluation uses a gender-sensitive approach by ensuring the collection of disaggregated data and by using gender-sensitive data collection tools, the gender analysis does not cascade through the report as gender is not reflected in the conclusions or recommendations.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)



Highly Satisfactory

The executive summary is concise and adequately informs end users about the object of the evaluation and the evaluation process itself, including key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary only includes information that is developed in greater detail in the body of the report.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

8

Meets requirements

Recommendations for improvement

**Lessons for
managing
future
evaluations:**

This report can be used with confidence by decision-makers as it presents high quality findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations that are based on the sound use of robust analysis of credible evidence. In the future, the evaluation manager(s) may wish to consider organising a findings and recommendations stakeholder validation workshop to discuss draft evaluation findings with key stakeholders and to ask them for their input when developing the recommendations. This is a useful process to ensure that the evaluation findings are factual and accurate and to develop useful recommendations with buy-in from key stakeholders.

Section A	This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
Section B	This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
Section C	Even if already mentioned in the ToRs, it is important to explicitly discuss in the body of the report the rationale for the exclusion of any standard OECD/DAC criteria, in this case, that of impact. Also, when discussing the ethical safeguards applied during the conduct of the evaluation, good practices recommend that the obligations of the evaluators, (i.e. credibility, impartiality, absence of conflict of interest, etc.), be specified.
Section D	This section generally observes good practices. However, it is recommended that not only positive unintended effects be discussed in the report, but also any undesired ones in order to objectively contribute to programme strengthening in the future.
Section E	This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
Section F	It is important that the report discuss the process followed in developing the recommendations as well as the level of stakeholder involvement in this process as this provides assurance that the recommendations were adequately validated and enriched with the input of those directly involved in the LSE roll out.
Section G	The structure of the report observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
Section H	Good practices recommend that a gender analysis be used throughout all sections of the report, including the conclusions and recommendations. Stakeholders should also be consulted during the development of the recommendations in order to provide validation.
Section I	The executive summary observes good practices. No further improvement is required.