Terms of Reference of Terminal Evaluation
for
Project SAU10/90406 – Capacity Development of Public Education Evaluation
Indicators (8 Days Home-Based, 10 Days on Location)

United Nations Development Programme, Saudi Arabia

Implementation Partner: Education Evaluation and Training Commission

1. Background and context

- **National Context**

The evaluation of education is an essential process for the educational development, as it constitutes a key element in the government's institutional work to improve public education with all its elements and levels. The systematic evaluation depends of an organized and independent statistical and analytical extrapolation of the educational efforts, as well as deduction of evidence and indicators to reach specific recommendations to guide the development efforts and the process of making sound decisions on them. For the best practice of education evaluation, the evaluation process is based on regulatory and procedural legislation and mechanisms that guarantee for those in charge of public education institutions a positive interaction with the wise requirements to support the national economy and development under the general policy of the Kingdom.

As of recent, the Kingdom is witnessing development at an unprecedented speed and at various levels of economic and social development, with a clear progress in the fields of economic base diversification and infrastructure development.

In April 2016, the Saudi Vision 2030, an ambitious blueprint for development, was launched. The overall objective of this vision is to transform the economy from its conventional reliance on oil and natural gas to a more diversified economy based on sustainable development. In an effort to build the institutional capabilities required to achieve the ambitious goals of the vision, the National Transformation Programme 2020 (NTP2020) was launched in June 2016 across 24 governmental bodies operating in the economic and development sectors. The NTP2020 uses innovative methods to identify challenges, seize opportunities, adopt effective planning tools, activate the role of the private sector, bring about implementation and evaluate performance against a set of results and key performance indicators.

The educational system requires a high degree of transparency as well as an accurate scientific review for all aspects of the educational process. There is a clear difference between an educational system that gives the student a minimum level of competencies, knowledge and skills, and another that builds human capacity, achieves community efficiency, and contributes to society's economic construction.

This project started out aiming public education, however, the focus has now shifted towards education in general in both the public and private sectors. The key objectives of the Project were:
A. Enhance the Commission's technical and regulatory capabilities in managing the educational process in the Kingdom.
B. Develop a comprehensive assessment of the Commission's areas of work in terms of school performance, educational programmes, school accreditation, and programme accreditation.

C. Develop an action plan to assess and build a quality system and professional licensing system for workers in the public education institutions and units.

D. Make and promote supportive systems for the management of qualifications to ensure the establishment of a national framework for qualifications that achieves effective linkage between the outputs of the educational system and the requirements of development and labor market.

E. Evaluate the educational outputs and propose a mechanism for reviewing them for the purpose of providing continuous evaluation of the efficiency of the public education system.

F. Support the Commission in the preparation of the strategic plan to evaluate the public and private education.

PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project	Capacity Development of Public Education Evaluation Indicators Towards the Preparation of Saudi Youth for the Knowledge Based Society and Economy
Atlas ID	SAU10/90406
Corporate outcome and output	Improved knowledge-based equitable and sustainable development, underpinned by innovation and improved infrastructure **Output 1.1.** National policies developed to promote economic diversification with a focus on increased employment of nationals
Country	Saudi Arabia
Region	RBAS
Date project document signed	May 2014
Project dates	**Start May 2014** **Planned end December 2019**
Project budget	**US$9.9 million**
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	**US$8.6 million**
Funding source	**Government Cost Sharing**
Implementing party[1]	**Education and Training Evaluation Commission (ETEC)**

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

UNDP has initiated the evaluation as a mandatory exercise at the terminal of the project implementation to provide all stakeholders with impartially derived firsthand information on the status of the project and its relevance and performance towards achieving the objectives as listed in the Project Documents. The purpose of the evaluation is to perform an in-depth assessment from

---

[1] It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

technical and managerial viewpoints to see whether the project has successfully accomplished its objectives and to evaluate the impact and sustainability of the project outcome and to assess how the outputs of the above-mentioned project have contributed to enhance the technical, technological and organizational capabilities of the Education Evaluation and training Commission (previously known as the Public Education Evaluation Commission) as regards the management of the educational process in the Kingdom The findings of the mission will be useful for understanding the management and technical issues of the project and the progress achieved to date. Furthermore, all stakeholders will help in re-orientation and re-prioritizing of project activities as needed and facilitate in addressing specific issues by the project management.

The assessment of this project was strategically placed at this particular time in order to promote needed adjustments, identify lessons learned and draw up a sustainability plan for the project prior to end 2019, date of project completion. Efficiency and effectiveness are of prime importance but also transparency and accountability. The review will illustrate intended and unintended results.

The evaluator will be tasked to provide recommendations aiming to improve various aspects of the project towards achievement and quality delivery of the project.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

Relevance:
- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to educational, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country in line with Vision 2030 and the SDGs?

Effectiveness
- To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?

- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

Efficiency
- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability
- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

4. Methodology

The methodology would include desk review of relevant project documentation and direct consultations with the project management, staff and other key local stakeholders during two weeks site visit to Riyadh in October/November 2019.

The overall duration of the assignment is expected to consist of a site visit of 15 days plus a corresponding amount of desk work to pre-review the required project documentation and to finalize the reporting. This makes the total working days to be 21 working days

In carrying out the evaluation task, the consultant will pay particular attention to the following:
- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- Document review of all relevant documentation. This would include a review of inter alia
  - Project document (contribution agreement) and all budget revisions.
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans.
  - Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/financial monitoring reports.
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members and implementing partners:
  - Development of evaluation questions around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- Surveys and questionnaires including participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
  - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators.

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

An evaluation report and an associated power point presentation summarizing the findings of the evaluation and the proposed follow-up actions in a new **UNDP Project Document format**.
The content of the final report is expected to follow the structure below: (See Annexes 1,2&3)

- **Evaluation inception** report (10-15 pages). The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
- **Evaluation debriefings**. Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
- **Draft evaluation report** (60 pages including executive summary).
- **Evaluation report audit trail** (should the project be extended, or a new PD drafted)
- **Final evaluation report**.
  - Executive summary
  - Introduction, including description of the work conducted
  - Findings and conclusions
  - Recommendations, including, as applicable, a revised work plan to address the pending tasks and eventual corrective action to achieve the intended outcome as well as an improved system for measuring the impact of the project in terms of the impact of the education evaluation project
  - Annexes providing a brief summary of the documents reviewed and persons interviewed with the description of the key content / conclusions drawn and any other relevant materials.

- Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group
- Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.
- A Results and Resources Framework detailing potential revisions, in the case of extension

The consultant should present three hard copies of the report as well as an electronic copy. The draft final report should be submitted not later than three weeks after the end of the on-site mission and the final report within two weeks from receiving the comments of the project management and UNDP on the draft reports.

6. Evaluation consultant required competencies

- The consultant shall be an education specialist holding and advanced university degree preferably in education with around 15 years of relevant experience preferably with education evaluation as well as related indicators and knowledge economy. Previous involvement and understanding of UNDP's procedures is an advantage and extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is required. The consultant should also possess strong writing skills coupled with relevant experience in results-based monitoring and evaluation technique.
  - **6.1.   *Competencies***

- ***Corporate***
- Demonstrates integrity and fairness, by modelling the UN/UNDP's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

- ***Functional***
- Proven technical and intellectual skills in understanding and interpreting regional, national and local green financing issues;
- Ability to understand and analyze and political dynamics in the region;
- Demonstrated ability for facilitation and coordination skills;
- Background knowledge about the SDGs, United Nations and UNDP;
- Good teamwork and interpersonal skills;
- Flexibility and ability to handle multiple tasks and work under pressure;
- Excellent drafting and formulation skills;
- Excellent computer skills especially Word, Excel and PowerPoint;

- ***Leadership***
- Demonstrated intellectual leadership and ability to integrate green finance with broader strategic overview and corporate vision;
- Demonstrated flexibility in leadership by performing and/or overseeing the analysis/resolution of complex issues;
- Ability to conceptualize and convey strategic vision from the spectrum of development experience.

- ***Managing Relationships***
- Excellent negotiating and networking skills with strong partnerships in academia, technical organizations and as a recognized expert in the practice area.

- ***Managing Complexity***
- Ability to address global development issues;

- ***Knowledge Management and Learning***
- Ability to strongly promote and build knowledge products;
- Seeks and applies knowledge, information and best practices from within and outside of UNDP;
- Demonstrates a strong capacity for innovation and creativity in providing strategic policy advice and direction.

- ***Judgment/Decision-Making***

+ Proven ability to provide strategic direction to the project implementation process;

+ Independent judgment and discretion in advising on handling major policy issues and challenges, uses diplomacy and tact to achieve result.

6.2. Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
An education specialist holding and advanced university degree preferably in education (at least Master's degree)	10
Around 15 years of relevant experience preferably with education evaluation as well as related indicators and knowledge economy	10
Previous involvement and understanding of UNDP's procedures is an advantage and extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is required	10
Knowledge of a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.	30
Technical Proposal *(Requires to submit one page technical proposal on contract methodology and implementation)*	40
Total Obtainable Score:	**100**

6.3. Language

The required language for the post is English and Arabia is an asset.

7. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant should follow the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners."[2]

8. Implementation arrangements

The consultant will be responsible for the timely submission of the deliverables.

---

[2] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

The consultant will be appointed by UNDP country office. The Project Management at ETEC shall arrange for the consultant all necessary site visits and meetings in Saudi Arabia according to the ToR. The mission will maintain close liaison with UNDP Programme Coordinator, concerned agencies of the government, any members of the international or national team of experts as well as the Project Management Unit.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

18 working days in November - December 2019.
- o Preparation for evaluation, desk reviews, review of documents and inception report (3 days)
- o Field missions including, briefing, field visits, interviews, submission of outline on main findings and debriefing session (10 days)
- o Preparation of draft and final report (5 days)
- o Total
  - - 10 days in Saudi Arabia
  - - 8 days in home country

10. Payment Term

N	Deliverables/Outputs	# working days	Target Due Dates	Payment Amount (%)
1	Preparation for evaluation, desk reviews, review of documents and inception	3 days	Upon signing the contract	15%
2	Field missions including, briefing, field visits, interviews, submission of outline on main findings and debriefing session	10 days	1 December	50%
3	Preparation of draft and final report	5 days	25 December	35%

Inception report content

1. **Background and context** illustrating the understanding of the project/outcome to be evaluated.

2. **Evaluation objective, purpose and scope.** A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.

3. **Evaluation criteria and questions.** The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale. The stakeholders to be met and interview questions should be included and agreed as well as a proposed schedule for field site visits.

4. **Evaluability analysis.** Illustrate the evaluability analysis based on formal (clear outputs, indicators, baselines, data) and substantive (identification of problem addressed, theory of change, results framework) and the implication on the proposed methodology.

5. **Cross-cutting issues.** Provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. The description should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.

6. **Evaluation approach and methodology,** highlighting the conceptual models adopted with a description of data-collection methods,[3] sources and analytical approaches to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data-collection tools, instruments and protocols; and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation and the sampling plan, including the rationale and limitations.

7. **Evaluation matrix.** This identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered via the methods selected.

8. A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities including the evaluation phases (data collection, data analysis and reporting).

9. Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the workplan. Include specific assistance required from UNDP such as providing arrangements for visiting particular field offices or sites

10. **Outline of the draft/final report** as detailed in the guidelines and ensuring quality and usability (outlined below). The agreed report outline should meet the quality goals outlined in these guidelines and also meet the quality assessment requirements outlined in section 6.

---

[3] Annex 2 outlines different data collection methods.

Annex 2
Standard outline for an evaluation report overview

Annex 1 provides further information on the standard outline of the evaluation report. In brief the minimum contents of an evaluation report include:

1. **Title and opening pages** with details of the project/programme/outcome and of the evaluation team.
2. **Project and evaluation Information details:** project title, Atlas number, budgets and project dates and other key information.
3. **Table of contents.**
4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**
5. **Executive summary:** a stand-alone section of maximum four pages including the quality standards and assurance ratings.
6. **Introduction and overview.** What is being evaluated and why?
7. **Description of the intervention being evaluated.** Provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and evaluability analysis result, assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results.
8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
9. **Evaluation approach and methods.** The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis.
10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions.
11. **Findings and conclusions.** Evaluation findings should be based on an analysis of the data collected and conclusions should be drawn from these findings.
12. **Recommendations.** The report should provide a reasonable number of practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make.
13. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and as requested in the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation of the intervention.
14. **Annexes.**

Annex 3

UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards

This **evaluation report template** is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and be understandable to the intended audience. In a country context, the report should be translated into local languages whenever possible. The report should also include the following:

1. **Title and opening pages** should provide the following basic information:
   - Name of the evaluation intervention.
   - Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.
   - Countries of the evaluation intervention.
   - Names and organizations of evaluators.
   - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.
   - Acknowledgements.

2. **Project and evaluation information details** to be included in all final versions of evaluation reports (non-GEF)[4] on second page (as one page):

Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title		
Atlas ID		
Corporate outcome and output		
Country		
Region		
Date project document signed		
Project dates	Start	Planned end
Project budget		
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation		
Funding source		
Implementing party[5]		

---

[4] GEF evaluations have their own project information template requirements.
[5] It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)		
Final/midterm review/ other		
Period under evaluation	**Start**	**End**
Evaluators		
Evaluator email address		
Evaluation dates	**Start**	**Completion**

3. **Table of contents,** including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

4. **List of acronyms and abbreviations.**

5. **Executive summary (four-page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that should:
    - Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other intervention) that was evaluated.
    - Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses.
    - Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
    - Summarize principle findings, conclusions and recommendations.
    - Include the evaluators' quality standards and assurance ratings.

6. **Introduction**
    - Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
    - Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
    - Identify the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s) programme(s) policies or other intervention—see upcoming section on intervention).
    - Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

7. **Description of the intervention** provides the basis for report users to understand the logic and assess the merits of the evaluation methodology and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. It should:
    - Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** it seeks to address.
    - Explain the **expected results model or results framework**, **implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy.
    - Link the intervention to **national priorities**, UNDAF priorities, corporate multi-year funding frameworks or Strategic Plan goals, or other **programme or country-specific plans and goals.**

- Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
- Identify **relevant cross-cutting issues** addressed through the intervention, i.e., gender equality, human rights, marginalized groups and leaving no one behind.
- Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components (e.g., phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
- Describe the context of the **social, political, economic and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.
- Point out **design weaknesses** (e.g., intervention logic) or other **implementation constraints** (e.g., resource limitations).

8. **Evaluation scope and objectives.** The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.
    - **Evaluation scope.** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed.
    - **Evaluation objectives.** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
    - **Evaluation criteria.** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used.[6] The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
    - **Evaluation questions** define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

9. **Evaluation approach and methods.[7]** The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The report should specify how gender equality, vulnerability and social inclusion were addressed in the methodology, including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following:

    - **Evaluation approach.**
    - **Data sources:** the sources of information (documents reviewed and stakeholders) as well as the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the evaluation questions.

---

[6] The evaluation criteria most commonly applied to UNDP evaluations are the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

[7] All aspects of the described methodology need to receive full treatment in the report. Some of the more detailed technical information may be contained in annexes to the report.

- **Sample and sampling frame.** If a sample was used: the sample size and characteristics; the sample selection criteria (e.g., single women under age 45); the process for selecting the sample (e.g., random, purposive); if applicable, how comparison and treatment groups were assigned; and the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population, including discussion of the limitations of sample for generalizing results.
- **Data-collection procedures and instruments:** methods or procedures used to collect data, including discussion of data-collection instruments (e.g., interview protocols), their appropriateness for the data source, and evidence of their reliability and validity, as well as gender-responsiveness.
- **Performance standards:** [8] the standard or measure that will be used to evaluate performance relative to the evaluation questions (e.g., national or regional indicators, rating scales).
- **Stakeholder participation** in the evaluation and how the level of involvement of both men and women contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
- **Ethical considerations:** the measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information). [9]
- **Background information on evaluators:** the composition of the evaluation team, the background and skills of team members, and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation for the evaluation.
- **Major limitations of the methodology** should be identified and openly discussed as to their implications for evaluation, as well as steps taken to mitigate those limitations.

10. **Data analysis.** The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results for different stakeholder groups (men and women, different social groups, etc.). The report also should discuss the appropriateness of the analyses to the evaluation questions. Potential weaknesses in the data analysis and gaps or limitations of the data should be discussed, including their possible influence on the way findings may be interpreted and conclusions drawn.

11. **Findings** should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed. Findings should reflect a gender analysis and cross-cutting issue questions.

12. **Conclusions** should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision-making of intended users, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

13. **Recommendations.** The report should provide practical, actionable and feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the report about what actions to take or

---

[8] A summary matrix displaying for each of evaluation questions, the data sources, the data collection tools or methods for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question was evaluated is a good illustrative tool to simplify the logic of the methodology for the report reader.
[9] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines.

decisions to make. Recommendations should be reasonable in number. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable. Recommendations should also provide specific advice for future or similar projects or programming. Recommendations should also address any gender equality and women's empowerment issues and priorities for action to improve these aspects.

14. **Lessons learned.** As appropriate and/or if requested by the TOR, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

15. **Report annexes.** Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:
    - TOR for the evaluation.
    - Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data-collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate.
    - List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited. This can be omitted in the interest of confidentiality if agreed by the evaluation team and UNDP.
    - List of supporting documents reviewed.
    - Project or programme results model or results framework.
    - Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets and goals relative to established indicators.
    - Code of conduct signed by evaluators.